

JPRS 75730

20 May 1980

USSR Report

POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1034

FBIS

FOREIGN BROADCAST INFORMATION SERVICE

NOTE

JPRS publications contain information primarily from foreign newspapers, periodicals and books, but also from news agency transmissions and broadcasts. Materials from foreign-language sources are translated; those from English-language sources are transcribed or reprinted, with the original phrasing and other characteristics retained.

Headlines, editorial reports, and material enclosed in brackets [] are supplied by JPRS. Processing indicators such as [Text] or [Excerpt] in the first line of each item, or following the last line of a brief, indicate how the original information was processed. Where no processing indicator is given, the information was summarized or extracted.

Unfamiliar names rendered phonetically or transliterated are enclosed in parentheses. Words or names preceded by a question mark and enclosed in parentheses were not clear in the original but have been supplied as appropriate in context. Other unattributed parenthetical notes within the body of an item originate with the source. Times within items are as given by source.

The contents of this publication in no way represent the policies, views or attitudes of the U.S. Government.

PROCUREMENT OF PUBLICATIONS

JPRS publications may be ordered from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS), Springfield, Virginia 22161. In ordering, it is recommended that the JPRS number, title, date and author, if applicable, of publication be cited.

Current JPRS publications are announced in Government Reports Announcements issued semimonthly by the NTIS, and are listed in the Monthly Catalog of U.S. Government Publications issued by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.

Indexes to this report (by keyword, author, personal names, title and series) are available through Bell & Howell, Old Mansfield Road, Wooster, Ohio, 44691.

Correspondence pertaining to matters other than procurement may be addressed to Joint Publications Research Service, 1000 North Glebe Road, Arlington, Virginia 22201.

Soviet books and journal articles displaying a copyright notice are reproduced and sold by NTIS with permission of the copyright agency of the Soviet Union. Permission for further reproduction must be obtained from copyright owner.

20 May 1980

USSR REPORT
POLITICAL AND SOCIOLOGICAL AFFAIRS

No. 1034

CONTENTS

INTERNATIONAL

Strengthening Ties Between World Socialism and National Liberation Movements (V. Sidenko; MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 2, 1980)	1
U.S. Steps Toward Confrontation Prohibit Cooperation (V. Petrovskiy; MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 2, 1980)	23
Chinese Expansion in Southeast Asia (N. Yur'yev; MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA, No 2, 1980)	37
West Stalls Vienna Talks To Step Up Military Preparations (Vasily Morozov Interview; NOVOSTI DAILY NEWS, 30 Apr 80)	58
Ernst Genri on Growth of Neofascism in West and Asia (Ernst Genri; NOVYY MIR, No 1, 1980)	63
Soviets Troubled by Recent Iranian Statements (Dietrich Mummendey; DIE WELT, 29 Mar 80)	79

NATIONAL

Medvedev on Anthrax Epidemic, Nuclear Accident in Urals (Zhores A. Medvedev; PANORAMA, 14 Apr 80)	81
--	----

CONTENTS (Continued)

'PRAVDA' Discussion of Agricultural Problems Continues (PRAVDA, 9, 17, 30 Mar 80)	90
--	----

Responsibility for Field Operations,
by P. Voytyuk, I. Kotov
Kolkhoz Efficiency Reviewed, by Ye. Novikov
Improvements Required in System of Incentives,
by N. Kuznetsov

Self-Determination Struggle for Minorities Viewed (Sylvain Cypol; LE MATIN, 29 Apr 80)	103
---	-----

REGIONAL

Shortcomings of Abkhazian Party Organizations' Work in the Arts (K. Dumava; SOVETSKAYA KUL'TURA, 29 Feb 80)	105
---	-----

Briefs Kurd Theater	109
------------------------	-----

ERRATUM: In JPRS 75598, 30 April 80, No. 1029 of this
series please change the language in all the source-
lines containing SOVET TURKMENISTANY in Russian to
read: SOVET TURKMENISTANY in Turkmen.

INTERNATIONAL

STRENGTHENING TIES BETWEEN WORLD SOCIALISM AND NATIONAL LIBERATION MOVEMENTS

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian
No 2, 1980 signed to press 29 Jan 80 pp 3-18

[Article by V. Sidenko: "The Leninist Foreign-Policy Course and the National-Liberation Movement"]

[Text] In recent years the national-liberation movement has achieved impressive success. Factually speaking, the elimination of the colonial system of imperialism as a whole has been completed. Whereas, prior to the end of World War II, colonies and dependent territories constituted 28.6 percent of the world's land area, with a population of 30 percent of the world's population, at the present time the situation has changed fundamentally. The remaining colonial possessions account for approximately 2.5 percent of the territory and less than one percent of the earth's population. As of the present time, more than two billion people have thrown off the colonial yoke. The number of new states that arose on the fragments of the former colonial empires has reached 100 (of the total number of 160 independent states).

What we are discussing is not simply the disappearance of colonialism as a global system with the aid of which imperialism oppressed and suppressed the peoples of the East, and not only the arising, on the ruins of that system, of a galaxy of young sovereign states. There has been an unprecedented increase in the weight and influence of the former colonial and dependent, but now developing, countries in the world arena. They are becoming completely equal subjects of modern international relations. There has been a complete confirmation of V. I. Lenin's conclusion concerning the historic role played by the peoples in the colonies who, once they have been awakened, would participate actively in the resolution of the fates of the world. "Under the direct influence of the ideas of Lenin and the Great October, under the influence of the inspiring example of the development of world socialism," states the Decree of the CPSU Central Committee entitled "The 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin," "the national-liberation movement has had an outstanding victory. Many young states, as they strive to eliminate their backwardness and to

achieve economic independence and build a just society, are turning toward Marxism-Leninism, toward the experience of real socialism."

I

One cannot understand or explain such historic phenomena as the arising and the upsurge of the liberating struggle of the peoples on the "periphery" of the capitalist system, the devastation of what had previously been mighty colonial empires, and the increasingly stronger alliance between world socialism and the national-liberation movement, outside of Marxist-Leninist theory, without a consideration of the tremendous effect exerted by the Great October upon world development.

K. Marx and F. Engels left behind valuable research pertaining to the heroic resistance given by the peoples of Asia and Africa to the European conquerors. The works of Marx and Engels are not only full of sympathy for the long-suffering peoples, but also attest to the thorough understanding by the founders of scientific socialism of the historic inevitability of the completely national struggle against the colonizers.

In developing the Marxist theory, V. I. Lenin created a bold theory, which was thoroughly imbued with the dialectics of the class and national-liberation struggle, for a single worldwide revolutionary process. In his report at the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Communist Organizations of the Peoples of the East, he emphasized that "... the socialist revolution will be not only and not chiefly the struggle waged by the revolutionary proletarians in each country against its bourgeoisie. No, it will be the struggle waged by all the colonies and countries that have been oppressed by imperialism, by all the dependent countries against international imperialism"¹. That broad concept of worldwide socialist revolution was a new and brilliant contribution to the science of the revolutionary transformation of society. Prior to Lenin, no one had posed the question in that manner, no one had elaborated the principles and tactics pertaining to the interaction between the international struggle of the proletarians and the struggle waged by the oppressed countries and peoples.

V. I. Lenin advanced the extremely important principle pertaining to the defense of the interests of the peoples that had been oppressed by imperialism and that were dependent upon it, a defense by means of the victorious socialist revolution. "If we," he said, "now, in Russia, have frequently been forced to make compromises, to bide our time, since we are weaker than the international imperialists, then we know that a population of a billion and a quarter (in the colonies and dependent countries) constitutes a mass whose interests are being defended by us"². At the same time V. I. Lenin felt that the rapprochement of European socialism and the national-liberation movement, in its turn, would reinforce the positions of socialism. "Without the voluntary striving for alliance and unity on the part of the proletariat," he wrote, "and then of all the working masses of all countries and nations throughout the world, the cause

of victory over capitalism cannot be successfully completed"³.

Within the framework of the theory of the ways and forms of the transition of all mankind from capitalism to socialism during the era that was opened up by the Great October, V. I. Lenin elaborated a concept that substantiates the realistic capability of the noncapitalist path of the development of the peoples that are liberated from imperialistic domination. That concept opened up new prospects for social progress for the economically backward countries. The noncapitalist path makes it possible for them to achieve socialism not by way of capitalism (as in Europe and America), but by completely bypassing or interrupting the capitalist stage of development.

All this became possible thanks to the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, and thanks to the formation of the world's first state of the victorious proletariat. The worldwide revolutionary process entered a qualitatively new phase. The question of the alliance, the consolidation in a single anti-imperialistic stream of the revolutionary movement, of the international proletariat and its vanguard -- the working class of Soviet Russia which had formed itself into a state -- and the question of the liberating struggle of the oppressed peoples of the East took on a practical political nature. The national-liberation movement as part of the worldwide revolutionary process received a gigantic acceleration under the effect of the Great October. With its victory, the "concert" of the imperialistic powers was deprived of one of its participants and lost control over a considerable part of Europe and Asia. On the fragments of the Russian empire there arose a fundamentally new, anti-imperialistic state which raised on high the banner of peace, freedom, and social progress, and which issued a challenge to the forces of national and social oppression. "The Great October Revolution," the outstanding African patriot Amílcar Kabral wrote, "changed the life not only of the peoples of Russia. It pointed out to millions of oppressed people the path of the revolutionary struggle, it promoted the successful development of the national-liberation movement throughout the world."

From the very first days of its existence the Soviet state acted on the international scene as a force that actively supports the liberating struggle of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries. Whereas, prior to 1917, those peoples had been opposed by what was, factually speaking, a single front of the imperialist powers who were united by the striving to confirm colonialism as one of the unshakable bastions of the world order, the Great October completely undermined its very foundations. For the first time in history, a great country issued the challenge not to just one particular power or group of powers in the struggle for a piece of the colonial "pie," but, rather, came out against the imperialistic system as a whole.

The failure of the "crusade" waged by the 14 states against revolutionary Russia undermined the myth of the "omnipotence" of imperialism, and revealed

its internal weakness. ". . .Whereas the peoples of the East," V. I. Lenin wrote, "had previously been only little sheep confronting the imperialistic wolf, Soviet Russia was the first to show that, despite its unprecedented military weakness, it was not such an easy matter to extend one's claws and fangs to it. This example provided by the Soviet infected a very large number of peoples"⁴.

The unprecedented upsurge of the liberation struggle has become an echo of October in the East. The onslaught against imperialism on the part of its colonial and semicolonial "periphery" has taken on broad scope, and tens and hundreds of millions of people have come into the movement. Here are only a few facts taken from the history of the national-liberation movement of that period. There has been a sharp increase in the rate of activity of the anticolonial struggle waged by the people of India. Under conditions of the upsurge of the anti-imperialistic movements in the East and thanks to the support provided by Soviet Russia, Afghanistan won its independence, abrogating in 1919 the unequal treaties that had been forced upon it in the past by the English colonizers. The young socialist state was the first to recognize the sovereignty of Afghanistan and to establish diplomatic relations with it. The people's revolution was victorious in Mongolia; the Kemal revolution occurred in Turkey; the Kajar dynasty was overturned in Iran; numerous uprisings of Arab nations flared up; there was an intensification of the mass discontent in Indonesia, which ended in the armed uprising of 1926-1927; and China was overtaken by the anti-imperialistic revolution. Africa entered the movement: uprisings flared up in Dahomey and Egypt, and Kenya and the Union of South Africa began to seethe. And all this occurred within the very first decade after the victory of the Great October.

With the victory of the October Revolution, for the first time in the history of mankind, the demand to grant independence to the peoples of the colonies and the dependent countries was shounded as a principle of state policy. In the famous Peace Decree that was signed by V. I. Lenin and adopted by the 2nd All-Russian Congress of Soviets on 26 October (8 November) 1917, young Soviet Russia appealed to all the countries who were participating in World War I to begin immediately to conduct negotiations for a just, democratic peace without annexations or reparations. "By annexation -- or the seizure of other people's land," the decree explained, "the government understands, in accordance with the legal awareness of democracy in general and the working classes in particular, every addition to a large or strong state of a small or weak nationality without the precisely, clearly, and voluntarily expressed consent and desire of that nationality, regardless of when that coercive annexation occurred, and also regardless of the degree of development and backwardness of the nation that is coercively annexed or coercively kept within the confines of the particular state. And also, finally, regardless of whether that nation lives in Europe or in remote countries across the sea"⁵. Thus, the maintenance of colonial regimes was declared in this historic document to be "annexation, that is, seizure and coercion." The decree contained a summons for the liberation of all the enslaved countries.

Of course, the Soviet government did not harbor even the slightest illusions that imperialism would respond to the summons issued by the young Republic of Soviets and would voluntarily renounce its colonies. And it issued a revolutionary appeal over the heads of the imperialist rulers, directly to the peoples who were in a state of colonial and semicolonial dependence. On 20 November (3 December) 1917, the appeal "To All the Muslim Workers of Russia and the East" was published. And although the name mentioned only the "Muslims," in essence that appeal was addressed to all the peoples of Asia and Africa irrespective of their racial, national, or religious affiliation -- to all those "whose heads and property, whose freedom and motherland had been traded for hundreds of years by the greedy predators of Europe. . ." The ardent words in the appeal resounded throughout the world -- "Overthrow these predators and enslavers of your countries. . . . Throw off your shoulders the age-old usurpers of your land! Do not allow them any more to pillage your beloved hearths! You yourselves must be the masters in your country! You yourselves must organize your life according to your own manner and likeness! You have the right to do this, since your fate is in your own hands"⁶.

In response to the support by the young socialist state of the struggle waged by the countries that were enslaved by imperialism, the peoples who had been shackled by colonial slavery attempted, on their part, to do everything to help that socialist state in its struggle. During the years of the foreign intervention against the Country of Soviets, the advanced representatives of public opinion in the oppressed countries actively joined the movement under the slogan, "Hands off Soviet Russia!" The delegates of the combatant peoples participated in the work of the Comintern congresses and of other forums of the international workers and national-liberation movement, at which they invariably expressed feelings of friendship toward our country and their admiration of it. One of the first such forums was the congress of the peoples of the East in Baku, which was held in September 1920. In its resolution the congress mentioned the role of the "Russian workers' revolution, which awakened the workers in the colonies and the dependent countries to the struggle for liberation."

The principles expounded in the Peace Decree, and in the appeal "To All the Muslim Workers of Russia and the East, formed the basic of the foreign-policy activities of the Soviet state from the very first moment of its existence. For example, the instructions given to the first Soviet ambassador in Iran and approved by V. I. Lenin stated, "Our Eastern policy remains diametrically opposed to the Eastern policy of the imperialist countries. Our Eastern policy strives for the independent economic and political development of the Eastern peoples and will support them in this matter in every way. We view our role and our calling in being the natural and unselfish friends and advisors of the peoples struggling to acquire their own complete, independent economic and political development"⁷.

II

The anti-imperialistic essence of the Country of Soviets as a new type of state manifested itself from the very first days of its existence, not only

in the sphere of the bilateral contacts with the independent countries of the East, but also in the diplomatic struggle against the imperialist predators on the worldwide scene.

At the international conferences in the 1920's in which the young proletarian state participated for the first time, it advanced a clear-cut program for the extirpation of colonialism. On the eve of the 1922 Genoa Conference, V. I. Lenin proposed introducing into the basic paragraphs of the directive for the Soviet delegation the requirement concerning the "use in all colonies and dependent countries and nations of the 'Irish' resolution" (reference to the winning of state sovereignty by Ireland in December 1921). Soviet diplomacy also used, for the purpose of combatting colonialism, the tribune of the 1922-1923 Lausanne Conference. In the course of that conference, it subjected to sharp criticism the unequal treaties that had been forced by imperialism upon the peoples of the Middle East. Characterizing the Lausanne Conference, People's Commissar of Foreign Affairs G. V. Chicherin called it a diplomatic skirmish of the most tremendous importance between the awakened East and western imperialism, in which skirmish "the Soviet republics act in their worldwide historical role of a friend to the oppressed peoples who are combatting the oppression by imperialism." At the International Economic Conference in Geneva (1927), the Soviet Union advanced a program that stipulated as one of the chief requirements "the annihilation of the system of protectorates and mandates, the withdrawal of troops from the colonies, and the granting to all peoples of the freedom of political and economic self-determination"⁸.

The Soviet Union demonstrated with new force its implacability toward colonialism when it entered the League of Nations (September 1934). When this question was being considered in December 1933, the VKP(b) Central Committee decreed that the USSR could accept the proposal that had been made to it, to become a member of the League of Nations, with a number of stipulations, most of which pertained to the national-colonial question. Our country, in particular, censured Article 22 of the League of Nations Charter, which gives the right to the mandate administration of other people's territories, and spoke out in favor of including in the Charter a paragraph concerning the mandatory national and racial equality of all the League members.

The well-principled nature of the foreign-policy course of the Soviet Union manifested itself with particular clarity in the question of stopping the aggression by fascist Italy against Ethiopia. The USSR came out in favor of the immediate application to it, as the aggressor, of the sanctions that were stipulated by the League of Nations Charter. The socialist state not only provided moral support to the victim of that aggression, but also granted material assistance to the Ethiopian people through the Union of Societies of the USSR Red Cross and Red Crescent. The country of Soviets decisively refused to recognize the colonial annexation of Ethiopia which was announced by Italy in 1936. The struggle waged by the Soviet Union in the League of Nations and outside of it in defense

of the rights of the nation of Ethiopia for freedom and independence was highly rated by the Ethiopian patriots. People remember that struggle to this day in that country.

The forces of international reaction viewed the annexation of Ethiopia only as a prologue to the gigantic world drama, in the course of which the imperialist predators attempted to cut up the map of the world anew. In 1939 fascism unleashed World War II. After beginning as a skirmish among the imperialist predators, that war took on a qualitatively new nature after the entry into it of the USSR, which had been subjected to perfidious attack by Hitlerite Germany. The advanced public opinion in the colonies and the dependent countries became clearly aware of the great importance that the outcome of the struggle between the Soviet Union, on the one side, and German fascism and its allies, on the other, could have for their own fates. The people in the colonial countries followed that struggle intently and hopefully. The famous social figure in Senegal, Gabriel d'Arbousier, in the French magazine DEMOCRATIE NOUVELLE, wrote, "I recall months of the war when the radio carried to the most remote corners of our forests and our deserts the reports concerning the victories won by the Soviet Army, which was fighting thousands of kilometers away from our poor villages, reports which everyone instinctively greeted as reports concerning the victories of their own fighting men." In many colonies and semicolonies, for example, in India, the progressive public opinion organized an extensive movement in support of the Soviet Union.

On 24 September 1941, when the German hordes were rushing toward Moscow, the Soviet government published a declaration in which it announced its adherence to the principle of the self-determination of nations and emphasized, "The Soviet Union defends the right of every nation to its state independence. . ."⁹. This attests to the fact that, even in the most difficult moments of its history, the USSR has thought and worried not only about its own fate, but also about the future of all the peoples who were oppressed and enslaved by imperialism.

The Soviet Union, thus, fought for the rightful cause of the oppressed peoples on the fields of combat during World War II; it defended that sacred right also at the table of diplomatic negotiations, at which the problems of the postwar organization of the world were being resolved. A sharp discussion concerning the fates of the colonial possessions developed at the San Francisco Conference which opened in April 1945. During the discussion of the draft version of the United Nations Charter, the USSR delegation decisively insisted that that charter provide for the right of nations to self-determination, national equality, and the renunciation of racial discrimination. It was precisely upon the insistence of the Soviet delegation and despite the resistance put up by the colonial powers that these principles were finally enunciated in the United Nations Charter and thus won recognition in international law. From that day on, the colonies ceased to be viewed only as an object of domination by the home countries, and the peoples of the colonial countries, who had risen to the struggle for their independence, obtained the opportunity to strive for the

implementation of their rights, relying upon the United Nations Charter. "It was precisely the Soviet Union," the American newspaper CHICAGO SUN commented at that time, "that insisted upon the national equality and self-determination of nations, and also waged the struggle against colonial imperialism."

The consolidation in international law of such a fundamental principle as the right of nations to self-determination, a principle that had been advanced by our party's creator, V. I. Lenin, was an important step on the path to the elimination of the shameful system of colonialism. The historic victory over fascism, in the defeat of which the USSR, as is well known, made the decisive contribution, contributed to the fundamental change in the ratio of forces on the world arena in favor of the forces of peace, socialism, and social progress. Thus, the positions of the worldwide capitalist system were substantially undermined. A number of countries left that system. The worldwide system of socialism was formed. All this served as a gigantic stimulus for the struggle being waged by the peoples of the colonies and semicolonies. It is precisely from that moment that one has observed the tempestuous process of the disintegration of the colonial system of imperialism, a process which first encompassed Asia, and then Africa and the countries in the Caribbean Basin.

During the postwar period there was a rapid increase in the importance of the alliance between the forces of world socialism and national liberation as a factor contributing to the liberation struggle. That factor accelerated the process of the decolonization of Asia and Africa, and led to the headlong reduction of the zone of the direct dominance of imperialism over the African and Asian peoples.

The opportunities for the rendering of assistance by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries to the fighters for freedom were considerably expanded. That assistance has not only increased quantitatively -- it has also become more varied and more effective. Naturally, its forms were determined first of all by the conditions of the anticolonial revolutions themselves, that is, in the final analysis by the patriotic forces. In those instances when there arose the opportunity for the political settlement of the conflict between the colonizers and the forces of liberation, the USSR actively supported the latter in the moral-political and diplomatic sense. But wherever the conflict grew into an armed struggle, our country considered it its international duty to provide the patriots also with military support, obviously, exclusively upon their request.

By the beginning of the 1960's, under the effect of the immeasurably intensified struggle waged by the peoples of the colonial countries, which was based upon the growing assistance and support provided by the socialist countries and the progressive forces in the "home countries" themselves and throughout the world, there was formed a situation when it became clear that colonialism could no longer be tolerated. The time had come to resolve the question of declaring colonialism to be illegal from the point of

view of international law. In 1960, at the 15th Session of the United Nations General Assembly, the USSR came forward with the historic initiative of proposing the adoption of the draft version of a Declaration concerning the granting of independence to the colonial countries and peoples. That Declaration proclaimed the requirement: "To grant immediately to all colonial countries, and to trust and other nonself-administering territories, their complete independence and freedom in the construction of their own national states, in accordance with the freely expressed will and desire of their peoples"¹⁰.

The Soviet initiative was met enthusiastically by the session participants who represented the developing countries and by the peoples in the colonies. Its discussion developed into the bitter censuring of colonialism and the colonial powers. All the basic principles in the draft that had been proposed by the USSR were included in the document that was advanced by 43 Asian and African countries, which the 15th Session of the United Nations General Assembly approved by the overwhelming majority of votes as Resolution 1514 (XV). The importance of the Declaration that was adopted on the initiative of the USSR is difficult to exaggerate. That declaration not only subjected colonialism to moral censure, but also contributed to the further extension of the liberation struggle being waged by the peoples, as a result of which the underpinnings of the colonial system of imperialism were undermined. The collapse of the oldest and most long-lived colonial empire -- the Portuguese -- in the mid-1970's meant that an historic final line had been drawn under that system as a whole.

True, individual centers of racism and colonialism continue to exist on our planet, and the largest one of them is located in the south of Africa (Republic of South Africa, Rhodesia, Namibia). But even here one sees expressed more and more clearly the historic tipping of the scales in favor of the freedom fighters. Their success has been influenced to no small extent by the support that is being rendered to them by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. In the Program for the Further Struggle for Peace and International Collaboration, and for the Freedom and Independence of Peoples, which program was adopted by the 25th CPSU Congress, it was proposed to consider as one of the most important international tasks the complete elimination of all centers of colonialism and racism. Proceeding on that basis, the USSR has rendered and continues to render to the South African patriots all kinds of assistance and support. It has supported a demand for the exclusion of the Republic of South Africa from the United Nations, and has censured the occupation by it of Namibia and the seizure by racists of the authority in Rhodesia. "The armed struggle," one of the leaders of the Patriotic Front of Zimbabwe, Joshua Nkomo, said, "a struggle that has encompassed the entire territory of the country, would be impossible without the aid and support that have been rendered to us by the Soviet Union, the other countries in the socialist community, and all the progressive forces throughout the world."

The course of the Soviet state and the CPSU, aimed at the rendering of all kinds of assistance to the peoples who are fighting against the yoke of

colonialism and racism has always been and continues to be a constant in the foreign policy of the USSR. "Our party," L. I. Brezhnev stated from the rostrum of the 25th CPSU Congress, "has rendered and will continue to render support to the peoples who are fighting for their freedom. . . We act as we are compelled to act by our revolutionary conscience, our communist convictions."

III

The collapse of the colonial system became one of the most remarkable features of our time, an event of great historical importance. An entire group of young sovereign states appeared on the world scene as an active anti-imperialistic force. The acquisition by former colonies of their political independence, however, did not mean that the tasks of the national-liberation struggle have been exhausted, or that the time had come for the patriots to "sound the retreat and roll up the banners." Imperialism, using various means (military blocs, wars, plots, subversive activities, economic pressure, etc.), strives to preserve and even, insofar as possible, to intensify in new forms the colonial exploitation of the liberated countries, to make the independence that they have won only a formal independence.

The imperialist powers never missed an opportunity to test by means of the bayonet the durability of the young states. For example, according to computations made by the American Brookings Institute, during the postwar period the United States alone put military forces into action 215 times as an instrument of its "global strategy," with weapons being used in almost all instances against young states.

The aggressive war unleashed by the United States against the peoples of Vietnam and the other countries of Indochina convincingly demonstrated that the old bankrupt methods of imperialism have not yet been withdrawn from its arsenal. That was one of the most shameful and monstrous predatory wars of the twentieth century. It is all the more important to emphasize the deplorable results that this "dirty war" in Vietnam had for the American imperialists. The historic victory of the Vietnamese people over the imperialist aggressors and the internal reactionary forces was of truly great international importance. It proved that there are no forces in the world which are capable of breaking the will of peoples for freedom and independence.

Another example is the Middle East, where imperialism and its ally Israel, in essence, are waging a permanent war against the Arab peoples, refusing to take a course aimed at the truly just settlement of the problem. Furthermore, the intervention against the Dominican Republic in 1965, the interference of the NATO countries into the affairs of Zaire in Shaba in 1977-1978 and the landing of mercenaries in Benin in 1977, the aggression against people's Angola and "Operation Barracuda" against the Central African Republic. Are we really to believe that these and dozens of other large-scale and local armed conflicts do not attest to the fact that

imperialism has not rejected methods of force in the struggle against the national-liberation movement?

A new outburst of the military activity of imperialism, an outburst that borders on hysteria, is currently observed in the Near and Middle East, particularly in the area of the Arabian Sea and the Persian Gulf, where a tangible blow was dealt to imperialism's positions as a result of the antimonarchical revolution in Iran. The Iranian revolution created a breach in the global military machine of imperialism, removing from it such an important element as the shah's regime, which played the role of "policeman" in the Middle East. In the attempt to restore the positions that were lost, the United States is feverishly building up its military presence in the region. It is forming a "quick reaction corps" which it proposes to use in "crisis situations," and not only in the Persian Gulf, as was originally announced, but, practically speaking, throughout the developing world. The draft version of a "security pact" in the Persian Gulf has been brought out of the dust-covered files again.

Taking advantage of the crisis in Iranian-American relations that was caused by the holding as hostages of persons assigned to the U. S. Embassy in Teheran, Washington is attempting to supplement the military pressure upon the Islamic Republic of Iran with an economic blockade. The intention is to break the will and decisiveness of the Iranian people, to change the socioeconomic and political outlook of its country. On the world arena the United States attempts to represent the situation as though Iran's actions create a threat to international peace and security. It is attested to, in particular, by the recent attempt of the United States to push through a resolution in the Security Council concerning international economic sanctions against Iran. However, that attempt, which contradicts the interests of universal peace, detente, and the equal rights of states, failed thanks to the well-principled position taken by one of the permanent members of the Security Council -- the USSR, which regarded it as the manifestation of the principle of interference in the internal affairs of peoples and the trampling of their sovereign rights.

At the present time the United States, its allies, and China are also using for the purpose of inciting a militaristic psychosis the events in Afghanistan, around which events the propaganda machine of imperialism and Beijing has stirred up an unrestrained anti-Soviet commotion. This slanderous campaign has been extended in order to conceal from world public opinion the true situation that developed in democratic Afghanistan after the April revolution of 1978.

Numerous facts incontrovertibly attest to the attempt being made by the United States and China, acting in concert, to eliminate the revolutionary gains of the Afghan people and to overthrow the legal government of the DRA [Democratic Republic of Afghanistan]. The imperialistic and hegemonistic forces have unleashed a real "undeclared war" against revolutionary Afghanistan. The territory that has been chosen as a staging area is Pakistan, to which country the Middle Eastern headquarters of the CIA was transferred

after the collapse of the shah's regime in Iran. Several dozen camps have been created in Pakistan for the training of diversionary groups made up of the counterrevolutionary rabble. Gangs that have been sent into Afghanistan make raids on populated places, plunder and kill the inhabitants, and disorganize the life in individual parts of the country. Similar camps are also in operation on the territory of China, which has been nurturing plans for a long time to annex the eastern part of Afghanistan, which is viewed in Beijing as "lost Chinese territories." Other reactionary forces which finance the counterrevolutionaries and supply them with weapons have also joined in the "undeclared war" against the DRA.

The scope of the interference of the forces of imperialism and hegemonism into the internal affairs of the sovereign state by the end of 1970 reached such a size that there arose a real threat to the revolutionary gains of the Afghan people and to the stability in the region. "The unceasing armed intervention, the far-ranging conspiracy by the external forces of reaction," L. I. Brezhnev emphasized in his answers to questions asked by a PRAVDA correspondent, "have created a real threat to the loss by Afghanistan of its independence, the conversion of Afghanistan into an imperialistic staging area on the southern border of our homeland. In other words, the time had come when we were forced to respond to the request issued by the government of a country that is friendly to us, Afghanistan. Acting otherwise would have meant giving up Afghanistan to imperialism so that the imperialists could tear it to pieces, would have meant making it possible for the aggressive forces to repeat there what they had managed to do, for example, in Chile, where the people's freedom was drowned in blood."

Rendering fraternal assistance to the people of Afghanistan, the Soviet Union acted in complete conformity with the Treaty of Friendship, Goodneighborliness, and Cooperation which had been signed between our two countries in December 1978, and also with the United Nations Charter, which recognizes for every state the right to its individual and collective self-defense. A limited Soviet military contingent was sent into Afghanistan at the request of its government, exclusively for the purpose of rendering assistance in repelling armed interference from without.

Washington has an equally hostile reaction to the revolutionary upsurge that is currently being observed in Central America. In that region American imperialism to this very day has not rejected either the military provocations against revolutionary Cuba or its plans to stifle the other progressive regimes. Upon coming up against the intensified struggle waged by the peoples of the continent against the hired pro-imperialistic regimes, Washington newly resorted to the "big stick" policy, announcing the formation in Florida of a permanent "Caribbean united combat special staff." It is planned to attach combat units to it "for maneuvers and actions." Large-scale naval maneuvers have been held in the Caribbean Sea, and it has been announced that it is planned to hold them there regularly.

Nor has imperialism's economic grip been weakened in any way. The economy of most of the liberated states continues to function within the framework of the worldwide capitalist economy chiefly as a raw-materials appendage for that economy, as a market for selling the industrial output of the developed countries, a profitable sphere of application of monopoly capital, and as a source of superprofits. The positions of the transnational corporations in the young states are so strong that the Madagascan representative to the United Nations, B. Rabetafik, at the 34th Session of the United Nations General Assembly characterized their activity as the expression of the economic and financial dominance of the West in the developing world with the aim of extracting superprofits. In 1977 alone the outflow of net profit from Western private investments, and also in the form of payments and interests on loans from the liberated states to the leading capitalist states, exceeded \$50 billion.

The words spoken by V. I. Lenin continue to be valid in our day. The ideologists of imperialism, he emphasized, "talk about national liberation . . . , leaving in the shadows economic liberation. And actually," V. I. Lenin emphasized, "it is precisely the latter which is the most important"¹¹.

The struggle for economic liberation requires the nations to exert truly titanic efforts. The system of economic dominance of monopoly capital in the developing world rests not only upon the unequal structure that has developed with regard to international economic ties, but also upon the global military machine of imperialism. That machine is put into action every time when a threat to its interests arises. Are we really to believe that it was not for the sake of the copper and uranium of Shaba, which bring gigantic profits to the monopolies, that the troops from the NATO countries were sent into Zaire? Was it not for these same purpose that the interventionists were sent to the other end of the world, to the Central African Republic? In the name of what was the punitive expedition against Angola organized? For the sake of petroleum and diamonds! And are we really to believe that the "quick reaction corps" in the area of the Persian Gulf is being formed not for the purpose of guaranteeing the interests of the U. S. oil magnates? And that is how it is everywhere.

Thus, there are all justifications for stating that, with the winning of political sovereignty, the front of the liberation struggle waged by the developing countries against imperialism and neocolonialism has not only not been narrowed, but also has substantially expanded. A factor that is taking on greater and greater importance in this struggle is the social, class factor.

The present-day tasks of the national-liberation revolution open up new broad horizons for cooperation between the USSR and the developing countries. In this situation, the roads of world socialism and the national-liberation movement are coming closer and closer together. There arises the necessity of the further reinforcement and expansion of their interaction on an anti-imperialistic basis. This is specifically what the advanced forces in the developing countries are calling for, since they are well aware that the

consolidation of the alliance between the countries of victorious socialism and the liberated states corresponds to the interests of the forces of peace, democracy, and social progress.

In recent years the relations among the USSR, the socialist community, and the liberated countries, both on a bilateral and a multilateral basis, received their further development. Shifts have been observed along all lines, but primarily in the political sphere, including international. Whereas in 1960 the Soviet Union maintained diplomatic relations with 29 countries in Asia, Africa, Oceania, and Central America, by 1979 that number had reached 76. In October 1979 the decision was made to establish diplomatic relations between the USSR and Nicaragua, where the bloody pre-American Somoza regime had been overthrown.

Forming the basis of the relations between our country and the other socialist countries and the young states is the objective mutual self-interestedness in the reinforcement of the peace and security of nations, the democratization of international relations, and the struggle against the imperialistic policy of dictate and exploitation, all of which features give these relations special durability and stability. A factor that is taking on great importance at the present time is the cooperation among among the USSR, the other socialist countries, and the liberated states in the sphere of the guaranteeing of peace and security on our planet. Coming forward as the initiator of the struggle for international detente and the reorganization on international relations on principles of peaceful co-existence, the Soviet Union is by no means guided simply by the interests of its personal security. It proceeds from the premise that positive shifts in international relations contribute to the improvement of the world situation as a whole. Peace and security cannot be the privilege only of individual countries or regions, of individual nations or one part of mankind. Our party and our state proceed from the premise that the confirmation of the principles of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, the establishment of broad international cooperation on the basis of goodneighborliness and mutual advantage, and the exclusion from intergovernmental relations of all forms and methods of hegemonism, dictate, threat of force, and blackmail conform to the national interests of all countries and peoples.

The imperialistic circles have counted upon having the international detente lead to the discontinuation of the liberation struggle waged by nations. Among the bourgeois ideologists, the course aimed at the lessening of tension has frequently been treated as a kind of guarantee to the preservation of the sociopolitical and economic status quo in the world. The attempt is being made to extract from the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, "in the name of detente and the normalization of relations with the West," the renunciation of the support of the national-liberation movement, the waiving of internationalistic principles and the solidarity with the peoples which are combatting imperialism.

Actually, the detente proved to be not a deterrent, but, rather, a powerful

additional stimulus for the intensification of the struggle waged by the liberated countries against the imperialistic policy of dictate, of trampling the rights of peoples, of slighting the weak and small states. The favorable international climate created by the efforts of the USSR and the socialist community has been contributing to the upsurge of the anti-imperialistic struggle waged by the peoples of the former colonial and semi-colonial "periphery" of capitalism, and the elimination of "hot spots" in the world. It was specifically these efforts which brought substantially closer the victory of the peoples of Indochina and contributed to the normalization of the situation on the Indochinese peninsula, the collapse of the Portuguese colonial empire, and, finally, to the intensification of the struggle waged by the developing countries for their economic liberation and against discrimination in international economic relations.

The processes of detente open up new opportunities for restraining the arms race. And the reduction of military expenditures, unconditionally, would have a positive effect upon the expansion of the opportunities for the economic aid to the developing countries. The Soviet Union proposed reducing by 10 percent the military budgets of the member states in the United Nations Security Council and using part of the funds thus saved for the purpose of rendering assistance to the liberated states. It is clear that the carrying out of this measure would not only limit the arms race and thus reduce the military danger for the developing countries on the part of imperialism, but would also free tremendous amounts of money for peaceful purposes, including the increase in aid to the young states.

That is why a decisive departure from the policy of operating "from a position of strength," of confrontation, of the "cold war," a departure for which the socialist countries are striving, conforms to the vital interests also of the developing states. It should be stated that the efforts of the USSR which have been aimed at the materialization of the detente and at the restraining of the arms race find understanding and support in the liberated countries, and are supplemented by their actions in this direction, particularly in the United Nations and other international organizations. One of the evidences of the fruitful cooperation between the USSR and the developing countries on the international scene was the discussion at the 34th Session of the United Nations General Assembly of the Soviet proposal concerning the inadmissibility of the policy of hegemonism in international relations. The adopted resolution, which was proposed to the developing countries, contains all the basic principles enunciated in the draft version that was introduced by the Soviet delegation. That resolution is one of the most important political decisions of the United Nations, and a substantial contribution to the cause of detente and the confirmation of democratic principles in international relations.

This kind of cooperation is all the more necessary at this time, on the borderline between the 1970's and the 1980's, when the imperialistic and hegemonistic forces, and primarily definite U. S. circles together with Beijing, have deliberately exacerbated the international situation, seeing in detente, as L. I. Brezhnev emphasized, "a hindrance to their aggressive

plans, to their incitement of a militaristic psychosis, to interference in the internal affairs of other peoples." Those plans by the imperialists and the hegemonists to dominate over the world can and must be disrupted.

IV

The alliance between the liberated countries and the world of socialism, with the USSR, is taking on special importance, as has been shown by historical practice, in the crisis situations created by imperialism. It is well known that the contribution of our country to the reinforcement of the defense capability of a number of young states played no small role in their repelling of neocolonialistic encroachments. That is what occurred when imperialism and Zionism unleashed their aggression against the countries of the Arab East. Soviet aid was a substantial factor in the victory won by the peoples of Indochina over American imperialism, in the repelling of the racist intervention against the nation of Angola, in the success of the struggle for the preservation of the territorial integrity of Nigeria, Socialist Ethiopia, etc.

Obviously, the level of the political relations, like that of other relations, between the Soviet Union and the individual developing countries is dissimilar. The intergovernmental relations with certain of them have become so strong that there has arisen the necessity of formalizing them in the form of treaties of friendship and cooperation. Thus, the nature of the relations greatly depends upon the degree of independence with which a particular country carries out its foreign policy, and upon the social outlook of the forces that are in power there. But in all instances the CPSU and the Soviet Union in their policy with respect to the young independent states adhere to the principles of peaceful coexistence and effective, mutually advantageous ties.

Economic and scientific-technical cooperation, and trade, have become an important sphere in the relations between the Soviet Union and the liberated countries. The basis of this cooperation was laid by the Great October, by the arising of the world's first socialist state. V. I. Lenin, speaking in 1920 at the 2nd Comintern Congress, said, "There can be no disputes as to whether the proletariat of the advanced countries can and must help the backward masses of the workers or that the development of the backward countries can go beyond its present stage, when the victorious proletariat of the Soviet republics will reach out its hand to those masses and will be able to render support to them"¹².

The first economic and trade contacts between the Soviet Union and the countries of the East pertain to the period between the two world wars. The fundamentally new nature of the economic and technical assistance rendered by our country to the peoples of the East manifested itself in those conditions when the young proletarian state had to resolve tasks of socialist construction in a complicated domestic and foreign situation.

With the elimination of the colonial system, the volume of cooperation between the USSR and the developing countries began to increase rapidly, and its forms began to improve. That cooperation has developed into an important factor in international relations in the modern-day world. The chief task of the economic and technical ties between the USSR and the young independent states has been and continues to be the providing of assistance to them in their attainment of economic independence by means of the complete development of their national economy and the reinforcement of the state sector. In this process the world's first socialist state shares the conviction of the leaders of the liberated countries to the effect that their own efforts are the basis for the resolution of the vital problems of economic, social, and cultural construction, and foreign aid is of a subsidiary nature.

The basic principles of the technical-economic cooperation and trade between the USSR and the developing countries are the consistent and rigid observance of equality, mutual advantage, respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in one another's internal affairs. This cooperation is not linked with any political or other conditions that would infringe upon the national interests of the young states. The Soviet Union is not attempting to achieve any unilateral benefits or advantages for itself. There is one other feature that is very important -- the USSR maintains economic and technical cooperation with the developing countries irrespective of their state structure or the orientation of their social development.

There has been a considerable expansion during recent years in the geographic confines of that cooperation. The number of developing countries with which the Soviet Union maintains economic ties on the basis of multi-governmental agreements increased from 54 in 1975 to 64 in 1978. These include 21 countries in Asia, 33 in Africa, and 10 in Latin America. The volume of the economic and technical aid provided by the USSR to the developing countries increased in 1977, as compared with 1960, by a factor of 6.2, with that provided to the Asian states increasing by a factor of 5.2 and those provided to African countries, 8.3¹³. In conformity with the concluded agreements, our country renders assistance to young states in construction and expansion of 1050 industrial enterprises and other projects in the national economy.

At the present time there is growing among the young states not only their self-interestedness in the expansion of bilateral economic ties with the socialist countries, but also -- and this is very important -- there has been an increase in their gravitation toward cooperation of a higher type, for example, for the formation of cooperatives and specialization on a multilateral basis, and the development of well-coordinated relations within the framework of the CEMA. This striving finds its understanding in the USSR and the other countries of the socialist community, since they, on their part, are also self-interested in having their cooperation with the developing countries take on the nature of a lasting and mutually advantageous division of labor.

In recent years the liberated states have increased the actions that are aimed at the elimination of their unequal status in the sphere of international economic relations. This was aided primarily by the further deepening of the overall crisis of capitalism, the change in the ratio of forces on the world arena in the favor of socialism, the increasingly acute economic crises, and the currency-financial, power, and raw-materials crises that have encompassed the worldwide capitalist economy. "It is already clear now," L. I. Brezhnev noted in the Report of the CPSU Central Committee to the 25th Party Congress, "that, with the present-day relationship of the worldwide class forces, the liberated countries are completely capable of opposing the imperialistic dictate and of striving for just, that is, fully equal, economic relations."

The Soviet Union has come out actively in support of the legal requirements of the developing countries for the establishment of a new international economic order, the reorganization of international economic relations on a democratic basis, and the elimination from them of any elements of dictate, discrimination, or unequal rights. "The socialist states," F. Castro said at the 34th Session of the United Nations General Assembly in the name of the nonaligned countries, "did not take part in the international brigandage and do not bear any responsibility for that phenomenon -- the economic backwardness of the developing countries. Nevertheless they understand and accept as their duty the rendering of assistance for the overcoming of that backwardness, proceeding from the very nature of their social system, one of the principles of which is international solidarity."

The economic aid provided by the USSR not only directly contributes to the creation of the economic foundation for the independent development of the young states, but also enables them to occupy a more independent position in their economic ties with the capitalist world, and to strive more actively for the reconsideration of the unequal relations that were forced upon them by the imperialist powers. This kind of aid under modern conditions exerts upon the status of the developing countries an influence which is probably just as important as direct aid does, because at the present time it is necessary for the imperialistic powers to develop and carry out their own course with respect to the young states with a consideration of their ties with the socialist community. Frequently this leads to considerable concessions by the West to the developing countries.

One of the remarkable features of the present stage of the development of the liberated states is the increase in the number of countries that chose the socialist orientation. During recent years alone, the countries that have taken this path are Mozambique, Angola, Ethiopia, Benin, NDRY [People's-Democratic Republic of Yemen], Jamaica, etc. This attests to the intensification of the anticapitalistic strivings in the national-liberation movement and is the common achievement of all the worldwide revolutionary forces. Many states with socialist orientation have crossed the 10-15-year line of their existence, thus proving their political stability. The effectiveness of the economic policy of these states was demonstrated with the example of a number of countries.

It is completely understandable that it is precisely the countries with socialist orientation that have been demonstrating an increased interest in the experience of the progressive reforms that were carried out in the USSR, primarily in the former colonies of Russian tsarism, such previously backward regions as Turkestan. The historic practice of the Soviet Union actually suggests to the developing states the sequence of the tasks and the methods of the social reforms that overthrow capitalism. The problems confronting them, to a large extent, are similar to those which were resolved on the former fringes of tsarist Russia. These questions are, first of all, questions pertaining to the creation of a new, truly national state, the apparatus of authority in the administrative center and in the outlying areas, a revolutionary army, an independent economy on the basis of industrialization, the social and technical transformation of agriculture on the paths of the successive agrarian revolution, nationalization of the land, the forests, and the water resources in the interests of the broad masses of the workers, and the accelerated socioeconomic development.

Thus, properties that are organically inherent in the international policy of the USSR are the recognition of the principle of the sovereign equality of all peoples; the support of their struggle for social progress, freedom from exploitation, and for development in the direction of socialism. The Soviet Union does everything to reinforce the solidarity with the progressive forces, movements, and parties, which come out in favor of such a course, and which strive for its implementation. "Soviet citizens, and our friends abroad, can be assured," L. I. Brezhnev stated, "that the Leninist foreign-policy course is steadfast. It is determined by the decisions of the CPSU congresses, and is embodied in our entire foreign-policy activities. That course combines a consistent peace-loving attitude with the firm rebuff of any aggression. It has proven its worth during the past decades, and we shall continue to follow it in the future."

The solidarity of the CPSU with the progressive forces in the developing world is expressed in various forms. They include the reinforcement of the bonds of brotherhood with the communist parties of the liberated countries and the active support of states with socialist orientation. They also include the development of relations with the revolutionary-democratic parties that are occupying anti-imperialistic positions. At the present time the CPSU maintains ties with more than 20 revolutionary-democratic parties in the countries of Asia, Africa, and Central America, and the ties with several of them are maintained on the basis of mutually coordinated plans. The CPSU also strives to develop contacts with all other parties and organizations in the liberated countries which take anti-imperialistic positions with regard to various specific questions.

Having suffered a complete and resounding defeat in its attempts to cause discord between politically and economically between worldwide socialism and the national-liberation movement, imperialism is currently putting its reliance upon their "ideological" alienation. This confirms the conclusion of the CPSU to the effect that anticommunism and anti-Sovietism are becoming

the basic weapon used by reactionaries in the struggle against the democratic forces of the countries of Asia, Africa, and Latin America. The gigantic apparatus of the "psychological warfare" waged by the West has concentrated all its efforts on the attempt to discredit the experience of real socialism in the eyes of the peoples in the developing countries, and to undermine the trust that the liberated countries have toward the USSR and the other socialist countries. The forms and methods of the anticommunist and anti-Soviet propaganda are becoming increasingly refined.

Moreover, the United States is attempting to represent itself as the defender of those very principles which it has repeatedly violated, resorting to military interventions and plots against the young states, and installing reactionary regimes there. That manifested itself with particular clarity at the United Nations General Assembly, during the discussion of the artificially created "Afghan question" that had been forced upon it by the United States, its allies, and China. Characterizing that discussion as an attempt at interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, the socialist countries and a number of the nonaligned states revealed at the same time the actual motivations for the actions taken by the imperialistic and hegemonistic powers, which had caused a commotion about the events in Afghanistan with simply one purpose -- the purpose of disguising, with the aid of a smoke screen of lies and slander, the military preparations being made by imperialism in the Near and Middle East.

In the carrying out of its "geostrategic" goals, Washington found a suitable partner in the person of Beijing. This is attested to, in particular, by the negotiations which were carried out recently by the Pentagon leader with the Chinese leaders. This was, thus, a two-sided attempt on the part of the ruling circles of Washington and Beijing to heat up even more the centers of tension in the world in general, and in the zone of the developing countries in particular.

The peoples of the liberated states have been convinced on the basis of their own experience who their real friends are, and who are only pretending to be such. They are well aware of the fact that, both during the past, during the years of the struggle for independence, and during the present, the period of the struggle for economic and social emancipation, they can rely on the genuine and unselfish assistance and support of the socialist countries.

Quite recently the Western propaganda circles launched a new concept, in which there is a "substantiation" of the need for the developing countries to preserve a kind of "equal distance" from imperialism and from world socialism. That concept was also immediately picked up by Beijing. This "theory" received especially broad currency during the course of the preparation for the 6th Conference of the Heads of State and Government of the Nonaligned Countries in Havana. The principle of "equal distance" was actively forced upon the delegates to the Havana forum by the imperialist and Beijing propaganda services, using certain rightist forces in the nonalignment movement itself.

However, the efforts of the opponents of the cooperation between the liberated countries and the USSR resulted in complete failure in Havana. In their statements, many delegates gave the Soviet Union its due for its consistent support of the cause of the combatant peoples. That attests to the fact that the anti-Soviet and anticommunist propaganda of the West and its Beijing "friends" has a low "efficiency factor." This circumstance, obviously, does not preclude the possibility that the anticommunists and anti-Soviets will attempt repeatedly to attack the alliance between world socialism and the national-liberation movement, to split apart the front represented by the liberated states, and to attract various groups there to follow in the wake of their policy.

Historical experience teaches us in the most definite manner that the support provided by the Soviet Union, the other socialist states, and the international workers movement will continue to be a factor of the greatest importance for the national-liberation struggle. Faced with new social tasks, the combatant nations, simply by relying upon that support, will be able to inflict the final blow on imperialism, and to confirm their right to build their life in conformity with their own national aspirations and interests.

FOOTNOTES

1. V. I. Lenin, *Poln. sobr. soch.* [Complete Collected Works], Vol 39, p 327.
2. V. I. Lenin, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, Vol 41, p 235.
3. *Op. cit.*, p 168.
4. V. I. Lenin, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, Vol 42, pp 353-354.
5. V. I. Lenin, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, Vol 35, p 14.
6. Quoted from: *SSSR i strany Afriki* [USSR and the Countries of Africa], Moscow, 1977, p 21.
7. Quoted from: *NARODY AZII I AFRIKI*, No 5, 1971, p 13.
8. *Dokumenty vneshney politiki SSSR* [USSR Foreign-Policy Documents], Vol X, Moscow, 1965, No 113.
9. *Vneshnyaya politika Sovetskogo Soyuza v period Velikoy Otechestvennoy voyny. Dokumenty i materialy* [Foreign Policy of the Soviet Union During the Period of the Great Patriotic War: Documents and Materials], Vol I, Moscow, 1944, p 146.
10. *SSSR i strany Afriki 1946-1962 gg. Dokumenty i materialy* [USSR and the Countries of Africa, 1946-1962: Documents and Materials], Vol 2, Moscow, 1963, pp 9-10.

11. V. I. Lenin, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, Vol 22, p 187.
12. V. I. Lenin, *Poln. sobr. soch.*, Vol 41, p 245.
13. K. N. Brutents, *Osvobodivshiesya strany v 70-ye gody* [The Liberated Countries in the 1970's], Moscow, 1979, p 135.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1980.

5075

CSO: 1800

INTERNATIONAL

U.S. STEPS TOWARD CONFRONTATION PROHIBIT COOPERATION

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian
No 2, 1980 signed to press 29 Jan 80 pp 19-29

[Article by V. Petrovskiy: "Dogmas of Confrontation (Concerning the American Concepts of 'Global Conflict')"]

[Text] The present-day political situation in the West is characterized by the increasing ferocity of the struggle around the questions of "big policy." The central place among them is occupied by the question of the interrelations between the USSR and the United States, as the two most powerful powers that have developed historically, with two opposing socioeconomic worldwide systems. The forces that come forth in favor of the continuation of the policy of detente are being opposed more and more actively by the reactionary, militaristic circles of imperialism. It may be said that the militaristic, aggressive wing of the U. S. ruling circles and the ideologists who express its views are again attempting to gather under what one might call the same "ideological roof" the most extreme anti-Soviet fabrications and are openly demonstrating their disdain for the historical truth. They stubbornly refuse to consider the realities which not a single sensible person cannot ignore, since they were formed long ago and have developed into factors that determine the deep-seated processes and tendencies not only of today's situation, but also that in the distant future.

What, then, has been collected under this "ideological roof"? It is well known that a factor that became the primary and invariable postulate of Washington's foreign policy after the end of World War II was the hegemonism of the U. S. ruling circles, which has taken on global scope. Those circles have openly announced their claim to the leadership of all the rest of the world and the subordination of it to their selfish interests. In other words, what was occurring here was a series of attempts to create a "Pax Americana," that is, to "transform" the world according to the form and likeness of the United States. In this process the chief trend in the activities of the American theoreticians serving the policy of hegemonism has been, and continues to be, the ideological justification of the line aimed at the confrontation with the USSR, with

the world of socialism as a whole, which is acting as a powerful obstacle of the path of any hegemonistic claims, regardless of where they come from.

I

The various aspects of the American approach to confrontation with socialism are represented with graphically and most broadly in the concept of "global conflict," the roots of which go back to geopolitics. This is a concept that was firmly established in the foreign-policy thinking during the Cold War years. A group of American researchers which is known for its rightist views -- the associates at the Scientific Research Institute of Foreign Policy at Pennsylvania State University, made up of Professors R. Straus-Hupe, W. Kintner, J. Dougherty, and A. Cottrell -- asserted in their work *Protracted Conflict*, which had been completed by the end of the 1950's, that "the essence of international relations during the contemporary period is determined by the inevitable conflict between communism and the free world, a conflict which is of a prolonged, protracted nature"^{1*}. In the "Herter committee" report on "new diplomacy" which was published in 1962 and which was prepared with the participation of eminent political experts and reflected comparatively more balanced views, it was also emphasized that the conflict between the East and the West is "the original cause of international actions and it colors, in essence, everything that is undertaken in international relations"².

In both instances we are dealing with an attempt, if we may express it this way, to "make the incompatible compatible." The completely natural and regular competition between the two systems is equated here with the imperialist states' inherent struggle for world dominance. Thus the attempt is made to represent the socialist community as one of the sides participating in the struggle for world hegemony and thus to besmirch the peace-loving essence of the new social system, the foreign policy of the socialist states that have been coming forward decisively against hegemonism in any of its forms or manifestations.

Despite the certain nuances in their evaluations, the representatives of various political forces in the U. S. bourgeois camp converged during the Cold War period in one major regard: they counted on winning in the global struggle with the USSR not by means of the peaceful competition between the two systems, but as a result of a change in the social and state structure existing in the USSR and the other socialist countries.

The famous American researcher R. Barnet, in his book *The Giants*, writes, "Since the Russian revolution, there has been a holy belief in the United States that stable and peaceful relations require a large number of fundamental changes within the Soviet Union." "The orientation on ideology in U. S. policy with respect to the Soviet Union," R. Barnet notes, "reached

* [Tr. note: This and subsequent quotations as retranslated from text, not verbatim as in original English editions.]

its apogee during the era of John Foster Dulles, who believed, as a certain West German diplomat said, that 'Bolshevism was spawned by the Devil. . .'.³ Dulles' strategy lay in surrounding the USSR and threatening it, justifying that action by stating that was a matter of a "moral crusade." (For the sake of being completely just, one should note that even Dulles by the end of his days was forced to acknowledge certain objective realities in the world against which he had previously fought actively.)

During the Cold War years, the acceptance of the idea of a "global conflict" presupposed the capability of the direct use of military force either for the "containment" of the Soviet Union, or the "liberation" of the socialist countries of East Europe. In practice, all this developed into a constant "brinkmanship." The buildup of means of mass annihilation, primarily nuclear-missile weapons, was viewed as the most important element of the "balance of fear," which was declared to be the "best guarantee of peace."

The latest research studies of American authors retain the line of succession in what pertains to the hegemonistic claims, the hopes that the United States will win in a "global conflict," the striving to achieve a "transformation" of the socialist society, and the preference of fighting, rather than cooperating. The idea of confrontation between the two systems is emphasized with particular force, as follows from the assertions made by the authors of a report to the trilateral commission on questions of the new world order, R. Cooper, R. Kaiser, and M. Kosaka⁴.

"The results of detente do not mean the cessation of the conflict or the struggle between the two camps," state the members of the prestigious working group of the Atlantic Council that is headed by the former commander in chief of NATO armed forces, A. Goodpaster and the former permanent U. S. representative in the bloc's council, H. Cleveland, in a study called *The Growing Dimensions of Security*, which was published in November 1977⁵.

Proceeding from such an actually existing fundamental contradiction of the present-day era as the relations between the two systems, certain American foreign-policy theoreticians and practitioners declare that contradiction to be a "global international conflict" and arbitrarily tack onto it all the remaining processes occurring in the world. The goal here is completely obvious: to remove from an imperialism that retains its aggressive nature the responsibility for the conflicts that it engenders, and for the policy that is deliberately oriented at the inciting of explosive situations.

Here too the bourgeois ideologists and politicians cannot be helped by any assertions of the sort that the very concept of an international conflict is an age-old, fundamental category and even the very essence of international relations. Such assertions, regardless of the phraseology in which they are clothed, actually ignore the objective fact of the constantly expanding cooperation among the states with various systems in politics,

economics, science, and technology and, in essence, refute the recognition -- officially established in many international documents, including Soviet-American ones -- of the necessity and inevitability of the peaceful coexistence of states with different social structures as a pivotal problem in modern international relations. Thus the conflict is converted by bourgeois ideologists and politicians into a kind of metaphysical, suprahistorical category and is legalized as an "eternal," "natural" form of international relations, their chief content, their essence.

The true essence of this kind of "philosophy" is more than obvious. If the international conflict is "inevitable," then the United States as the "natural leader of the West" has nothing left for it other than the role of the leader of the so-called "free world" in the confrontation with socialism in all areas -- political, military, economic, and ideological. In other words, what we are dealing with is the substantiation of the very same hegemonistic strivings of the United States which constituted the basis of its foreign policy during the Cold War years. Moreover, one can see rather clearly the striving to substantiate the claims to hegemony in international affairs, claims to the dominant status in the capitalist world from positions not only of anti-Sovietism, but also with the aid of all kinds of speculations about the "protection of national interests," the "guaranteeing of national security," the zone of which is declared to be literally the entire world, encircled by a system of American bases and strong points.

In this regard it might be fitting to quote the following statement that appeared in the American magazine DEFENSE MONITOR: "The present-day interpretation of the term 'national security' means a global reliance upon a policy of strength. This is a dangerous course that opens up the path for direct intervention and war. Of course, it is far from our true national interests and leads to the isolation of American foreign policy."

Translated into the language of practical politics, of theorizing concerning "international conflict" as "inevitable" and "all-encompassing," the forms of international relations mean the unprecedented buildup of armaments, the return to the policy of operating "from a position of strength," the creation of newer and newer centers of tension and crisis situations that represent an immediate threat to universal peace and security.

II

Rendering the "global conflict" absolute and thus placing a "theoretical" basis under the hegemonistic claims of the U. S. ruling circles, the bourgeois ideologists and politicians propose various other recipes for finding the way of acting in this conflict which is most suitable for Washington and which would make it possible to guarantee the dominant positions for American imperialism.

Citing the notorious principle of the "exclusivity of the American nation," which nation is alleged to enjoy the blessings of freedom, democracy,

equality, and material prosperity, the political experts in the United States devote more and more attention to the "moral aspect" of the "global conflict." "The governments and peoples of the world," state, for example, the authors of the previously mentioned research *The Growing Dimensions of Security*, "must constantly remind people that the conflict between the East and the West is not a conflict between communism and capitalism, but is a conflict with regard to the question of the freedom and rights of man, his dignity and capabilities, the right of peoples to determine their own fate and to have a government of their choice"⁶.

What we have here is a flagrant attempt to prove that black is white, to rehabilitate in the eyes of public opinion the "value system" of the capitalist world and simultaneously, under the guise of the "struggle of ideas," to give new scope to the "psychological warfare" against the socialist countries, depicting them as the enemies of the "freedom and rights of man," and the United States as the "moral leader" of the West, if not the entire world!

There is certainly no need to go into deeper detail in order to prove the absolute groundlessness of the U. S. claims to "moral leadership." The scandalous facts of social injustice and inequality, the numerous violations in that country of the elementary rights of man, the oppression of the national minorities, and many other similar phenomena -- all these things are sufficiently well-known at the present time. The only thing that should surprise one is the hypocrisy with which the organic defects of capitalism are ascribed to another social system that is fundamentally different from it and that is doing truly everything for man and in the name of man.

Completely included in this deliberate deception is the striving on the part of certain American theoreticians -- not even mentioning the militaristic "hawks" -- to equate "psychological warfare," as a weapon of the U. S. hegemonistic policy, with ideological warfare, which is a natural phenomenon of our era and which by no means contradicts the principle of peaceful coexistence, mutually advantageous cooperation between states with different social systems. And yet ideological warfare in no way presupposes its development into "psychological warfare," with the methods that are inherent in the latter system -- lies, slander, and misinformation -- and with the preaching of misanthropy, racism, and hatred among peoples. Moreover, unlike "psychological warfare," ideological warfare does not have anything in common with interference into the internal affairs of other states.

With the emphasis that the American ideologists and politicians make upon the "moral leadership" of the United States in the "global conflict," the chief computations in the matter of the attainment of Washington's hegemonistic claims are tied in, primarily, with military force. "The capstone of our national security," the U. S. president said on 12 December 1979, speaking to his Council of Businessmen, "remains military might." This is an extremely unambiguous formulation of the essence of the present-day American approach to international affairs.

It is precisely for the purpose of carrying out the claims to domination over the other countries and peoples, and by no means as a result of an imaginary military lag, that the present administration is placing its reliance upon military force as the chief means of carrying out its hegemonistic policy. The most brilliant testimony of this is provided by the decisions which were made by the highest NATO agencies, under pressure from Washington, in December 1979 to build up the bloc's military might, and also by the unprecedentedly broad long-range military program which was proclaimed by J. Carter and which stipulates a constant increase in the "real" military appropriations (that is, those that take inflation into account) on the average of 4.5 percent a year.

There is something else that is typical. The spreading of the argument that there is a notorious "Soviet military threat," an argument that is used to justify the militaristic preparations, is combined with advances to the Beijing hegemonists, who, as has been indicated by events in recent times, are asking for a direct military alliance with American imperialism, an alliance that is aimed against the countries of socialism, and all the forces of peace and progress. Something that is extremely indicative in this regard is the frank statement by Z. Brzezinski to the effect that the conflict situation on the Indochinese peninsula is in conformity with the interests of Washington, inasmuch as that situation, in his words, "represents the first instance of indirect collision between China and the Soviet Union." This approach was detected with particular clarity during the Chinese aggression against the SRV [Socialist Republic of Vietnam], with which various figures in the militaristic circles of the United States linked their far-ranging computations aimed at undermining the cause of peace and social progress. Thus, on the soil of the concept of the inevitability of the "global conflict," the hegemonistic strivings of Washington and Beijing come together.

III

Both the new treatment of the essence of the "global conflict" and the choice of the means of struggle at the present-day stage have the goal of strengthening the U. S. positions both in the capitalist world itself, and in the worldwide struggle against socialism.

With a consideration of the increase in the power of the socialist system and the overall reinforcement of the forces of peace and social progress, special importance is attached to the consolidation of the imperialistic camp under the leadership of the United States, to the creation of bastions of American imperialism in various regions of the world. This is a matter of converting the development of relations along the "West-West" [sic] and "North-South" axes into the prerequisite and condition for actions in the chief sector -- the aggressive course with respect to the Soviet Union and the world of socialism.

Is it not obvious that this kind of "shifting of priorities" is very

explosive, and threatens the vital interests of mankind? The Soviet Union proceeds from the supposition that all states, regardless of their political and social system, must construct interrelations on the basis of unconditional recognition and respect for national independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and inviolability, equal rights, and noninterference.

In the resolution entitled "The Inadmissibility of the Policy of Hegemonism in International Relations," which was adopted on the initiative of the Soviet Union at the 34th Session of the United Nations General Assembly on 14 December 1979, there is contained, in particular, a summons to all states "to observe strictly the principles of the United Nations charter, as well as the principles pertaining to the respect of the sovereignty, sovereign equality, equality, national independence, unity, and territorial integrity of the states, noninterference in their internal affairs, non-aggression and the peaceful settlement of disputes, and cooperation, as well as the rights for the self-determination of the peoples located under colonial and foreign dominance"⁸.

At the same time the preservation and the consolidation of universal peace and security presupposes a particular responsibility on the part of the USSR and the United States as the most powerful states in the modern world. Moreover, detente imposes additional duties upon them: it requires a definite level of trust and mutual understanding, the manifestation of restraint and the readiness to conduct negotiations pertaining to questions of dispute, to settle the differences of opinion by peaceful means, and to observe unconditionally the principle of rejecting the application of force or the threat of force with the use either of nuclear weapons or of conventional arms.

In the course of the negotiations in Vienna in June 1979 L. I. Brezhnev and J. Carter stated, "The sides are united in that the state of the relations between the Soviet Union and the United States is of tremendous importance for the fundamental interests of the peoples of both countries and greatly determines the development of the entire international situation. Realizing the high responsibility that is linked with this, the sides have expressed their firm intention to carry the matter to the further reinforcement of the constructive basis of Soviet-American relations"⁹.

These are extremely clear-cut and highly positive formulations which, it would appear, introduce clarity into the essence of the problem. However, it has already become a tradition for American imperialism that its sometimes extremely magnificent and "humanitarian" declarations are followed by practical considerations which cancels them out completely. But at the present time we are present at a turning point in the aggressive course of the U. S. reactionary forces which even exceeds the tradition that was mentioned. It would appear that after the signing of the SALT-II agreement, the world situation made possible a substantial advance along the path of the effective detente, the extension of the detente to the military sphere, and also the carrying out of an entire complex of effective steps with the

purpose of preparing the forum in Madrid. But precisely because the real-life situation made it possible to advance considerably the cause of detente, the cause of bridling the arms race and reinforcing the mutual trust, the "dialectics" of imperialistic behavior began operating in its peculiar way: its representatives could find nothing better than to show their intention to return the international situation to the times of the Cold War and to build up the tension.

The facts are generally known, and there is no need to speak of them in detail here. It is important to note that other American political experts have invented one concept after another, which are supposed to "anticipate" this "dialectics." For example, S. Brown and the not unknown G. Ball long ago proposed to Washington nothing other than the "freezing" of Soviet-American relations, and advanced the slogan "no negotiations and no confrontation"¹⁰ or "polite disdain" [benign neglect?]¹¹.

One must, however, emphasize that the positions of a number of influential American politicians and theoreticians differ substantially from such a "philosophy." In the well-known book that was published in 1977 under the title *The Cloud of Danger*, G. Kennan sharply criticized the opponents of an improvement in Soviet-American relations and displayed serious concern with regard to the buildup of nuclear weapons and their proliferation. He issues the summon for a consolidation of the relations with the Soviet Union, which relations, in his words, are "the central problem in American foreign policy, a problem which, from the point of view of importance and complexity, puts all others in the background and upon the approach to which many other aspects of American policy depend"¹².

Another American international-affairs expert, S. Hoffman, recalls that without the participation of the USSR it is impossible to count on the settlement of acute crisis situations (such as, for example, the Near East situation) and that the allies of the United States, to whom other Washington figures propose devoting the "primary attention," are interested primarily and precisely by the state of Soviet-American relations, their influence upon questions of war and peace¹³.

Those who come out in favor of the preservation and the reinforcement of everything positive that was created by the joint efforts of the two countries in the 1970's refer first of all to the fundamentally new ratio of forces in the world in the military-strategic area. A researcher at the Hoover Institute of War, Revolution, and Peace, at Stanford University, R. Wesson notes that the USSR has become "the power that is second with regard to the might of its economy, with a gigantic industry and collectivized agriculture. The Soviet Union achieved a major victory in history -- during World War II -- and created a military might that is approximately equivalent to the might of the United States"¹⁴.

The preservation of strategic parity is justifiably viewed by the realistically-minded circles in the United States as a necessary condition for constructive Soviet-American interaction in the job of maintaining

international peace and security and the search for ways to guarantee them. "The prerequisite for progress in this direction," that is, in the matter of guaranteeing universal security, according to Lind Professor Miller, is the readiness of both powers to "refrain from violating the strategic parity"¹⁵.

The authors of the collection *Detente or Debauch*, which was published in 1979 by the American Committee for Agreement Between East and West -- the famous Professor J. Galbraith; the former assistant to the U. S. president, J. Kistiakowski; former State Department advisor S. (Pizar); Director of the Institute of Russian Studies at Princeton University, S. Cohen; member of the House Armed Forces Committee L. (Espin); and others -- in a well-argued manner refute the conclusions of the proponents of inflating the arms race and they note that the results that have already been achieved in the detent make it possible to change over to carrying out real steps in the area of restraining armaments and in disarming. For example, Professor Kistiakowski, noted that, as a result of the reorganization of the Soviet-American relations, there exists "one of the rare opportunities in present times to achieve a definite degree of stability in the increasingly dangerous world," and considers task number one to be "the cessation, or at least the limitation, of the arms race between the United States and the USSR, progress in the attainment of a more satisfactory state of the detente, peaceful coexistence, and the bridling of the increasing nuclear arms race as a whole"¹⁶.

Who can doubt that the task of limiting the arms race is of primary importance, inasmuch as, to a considerable extent, the degree of durability of the international peace and security depends upon its resolution? Apart from the direct threat of nuclear catastrophe, the arms race is the purposeless wasting of the material and spiritual wealth of mankind, which it needs for the resolution of the vitally important problems that are confronting it. It is an obstacle on the path of the political, social, economic, and moral development of mankind.

The unceasing debates in the United States concerning the place and role of American-Soviet relations reflect two tendencies in the understanding of the methods and means of carrying out the policy "in the Soviet sector": on the one hand, an unconcealed aggressive policy, and on the other, a relatively realistic one. These tendencies are backed up by the interests of various social groups and political forces within the dominating class.

IV

While undertaking attempts to disrupt or at least to hamper the further development of the detente process, the opponents of the improvement of the worldwide political atmosphere nevertheless are forced to consider the fact that the ideas of peaceful coexistence have already sent out deep roots in the consciousness of peoples and broad segments of public opinion. For that reason, more and more frequently they select roundabout methods for their attacks upon detente. The most widespread method is to recognize

detente by word but to oppose it by deed. The purpose of such operations is always the same -- to guarantee, in the changed conditions also, the carrying out of an aggressive course that contradicts the interests of international security.

At the present time the opponents of true detente are actively putting into circulation the concept of the "detente code." In and of itself, the use of this term could have a positive meaning if it contained truly large-scale components of a political, military-strategic, trade-economic, or other order. But what do certain American political experts propose? First of all, the meaning of the so-called "detente code," in their view, is in reducing the importance of the chief overall gain from the detente -- the reduction of the danger that a new world war will arise. In accordance, for example, with judgments made by T. Draper, detente actually does not play any considerable role in preventing nuclear war, inasmuch as, in his opinion, "the very existence of nuclear weapons itself leads to the point of absurdity any war with the use of a weapon which is too destructive"¹⁷. It turns out that the "existence of nuclear weapons" acts as a kind of guarantee of the prevention of war, irrespective of the policy aimed against war, irrespective of the mobilization of all the peace-loving forces on the planet to implement such a policy. As was shown by Hiroshima and Nagasaki, American imperialism was always ready to use death-dealing means, and if nuclear weapons have not been used by it during the postwar period, this is explained by the fact that the Soviet Union quickly eliminated the atomic monopoly of the United States, and also by the fact that the general line in the international policy of the world's first country of socialism is the unceasing, complete, uncompromising struggle, with the support of all the peace-loving forces, for the great cause of the reinforcement of the peace and international security.

But the position taken by gentlemen such as T. Draper, who deny the importance of detente as a way of removing the threat of thermonuclear war, in essence, renders detente barren, deprives it of its basic meaning and content. As a result, the only thing left of detente is its name.

The "detente code" that is advertised by a number of American political experts is unfounded for another reason. Its authors would like to remove the boundaries between two different spheres in modern political reality -- intergovernmental relations, where the question of primary importance is the question of choosing the methods and forms of resolving problems under dispute, and of conducting negotiations; and the social development of a particular country, which evolves independently of the turns taken by the international situation. The ignoring of these differences is obviously intended to render "compatible" two factors: the objectively urgent reorganization of the entire system of international relations on the basis of peaceful coexistence; and the struggle against the workers' and national-liberation movements.

The adherents of the so-called "detente code" would like to use the

opportunities which open up as that detente deepens, for the purpose of interfering in the internal affairs of the socialist countries. For example, a number of American and British theoreticians (A. (Ulam), R. Conquest, G. Grossman, etc.), under the completely false and hypocritical pretext of "defending the human rights" in the socialist countries, in essence, are attempting to establish a direct dependence between that invented problem and the development of relations between the East and the West. In other words, they recommend exerting pressure upon the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Consultant at the Stanford Scientific-Research Institute R. Pipes, for example, states "We call for internal changes in Russia and Eastern Europe with the aid of a 'third basket'" (he has in mind the humanitarian principles of the Helsinki Concluding Act) "and other channels"¹⁸.

It is completely obvious that appeals of this kind by no means have anything in common with the true intention of detente -- the overcoming of the Cold War and the transition to normal, mutually advantageous relations among states -- or with the norms of international law which regulate them. On the contrary, the work in the reverse direction, contributing to the heating up of the tension and to the increase in distrust. The noisy debates about the "detente code," which are accompanied by absurd "accusations" directed at the countries of socialism, are called upon to divert attention from the fact that the American side is canceling the obligations evolving from the detente, and it puts the emphasis on "throwing a bridle" on the development of the historical process, on "locking up" the cause of the national and social liberation of peoples. Thus, the expatiations about the "detente code" are nothing but a propaganda maneuver that is being used by Washington with the purpose either of avoiding the fulfillment of the pledges that it assumed in the appropriate bilateral and multilateral documents, or of acting counter to those pledges, taking steps to worsen the overall international political atmosphere and to encourage the arms race. In essence, what we are dealing with here is the replacement of the real pledges for deepening the detente by artificial ones.

Meanwhile the activists for mankind have at their disposal such an historic document as the Helsinki Concluding Act. And it is precisely that document which is a true detente code!

That which is proposed under the guise of a "detente code" by the American political experts is a somewhat renovated version of the imperialistic form of actions of the Cold War days, and the evidence of the striving to reinforce the hegemonistic plans of the United States by the policy of operating "from a position of power." Wouldn't it be more correct to call this -- pardon the expression! -- "detente code" an "antidetente code," that is aimed at undermining the policy of lessening the international tension?

In the concluding act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe there was a clear-cut formulation of the chief principles governing the relations among states. It might be beneficial to recall in this

regard the fundamental principles contained, for example, in such Soviet-American documents as the Principles for Interrelations Between the USSR and the United States, the Agreement Concerning the Prevention of Nuclear War, and a number of declarations, treaties, and agreements signed by the USSR and the other socialist states with the countries of the West. In accordance with all these documents, adherence to detente presupposes joint efforts in the prevention of thermonuclear war; the readiness to resolve differences of opinion and disputes not by force, not by threats or the rattling of sabers, but by peaceful means, at the negotiations table; the establishment and maintenance of an atmosphere of trust; and the readiness to take into consideration the legal interests of one another.

As is emphasized in the decree of the CPSU Central Committee "The 110th Anniversary of the Birth of Vladimir Il'ich Lenin," "the USSR, the socialist countries, and all the peace-loving forces in the world are persistently fighting to see that the detente remains the leading tendency in international relations, and to see that political detente is supplemented by military detente."

V

The transition of the military-industrial complex in the United States and its ideological and political representatives to the active counter-attack against detente creates an alarming situation in the world, and causes serious concern on the part of those who are striving to avoid the dangerous development of international events. For example, Professor G. Kennan, to whom we referred earlier, emphasizes, "Too much has been put on one card. It will be necessary to pay dearly for any political failures. The consequences of this failure will prove to be more far-reaching than even the unrestrained arms race." These words sound all the more convincing since they reflect the evolution of G. Kennan himself, because it was precisely he who, in the late 1940's, in an article published in FOREIGN AFFAIRS magazine, and signed by "X," formulated the notorious concept of the "containment of communism."

The sober-minded American politicians and scientists do not limit themselves to recognizing that the negotiations with the Soviet Union are influenced by the necessity of preventing a thermonuclear conflict. Many of them go farther than that, making the conclusion that stable peace cannot be automatically guaranteed by a "balance of fear."

"With the appearance of new destabilizing situations, new types of military technology, and the prospect of the proliferation of nuclear weapons and of the lack of any efficient political control over military policy, it would be the most serious delusion to think," notes, for example, the famous expert on international affairs, Professor M. Schulman, "that the risk of nuclear war is self-regulating and is automatically reduced as a result of the balance of fear. The task that should become the primary one for the governments is the settlement of the military rivalry. . ."¹⁹.

The acute struggle in the United States, in the ruling circles there, concerning the prospects of the Soviet-American relations and detente is continuing. That struggle was noticeably intensified as a result of the question of ratifying the SALT-II Treaty and as a result of a number of other problems. Most Americans are in favor of preserving and improving the climate of detente in international relations in general and in Soviet-American relations in particular.

Under conditions of the acute struggle in the U. S. ruling circles concerning the prospects of Soviet-American relations, President J. Carter, obviously guided by his pre-election considerations and by the desire to play into the hands of the chauvinistically-minded circles, took a course hostile to the cause of detente, a course aimed at tightening up the arms race and leading to the intensification of the military danger.

The attempts of Washington to "respond" to the aid which was rendered by the Soviet Union to the Afghan people in complete conformity with the historic Treaty of Friendship, Goodneighborliness, and Cooperation, and also with the United Nations Charter, by returning to the Cold War policy and by heating up the militaristic psychosis, attests to the fact that the U. S. ruling circles are only "playing at detente," but they are by no means acting in the direction of deepening and expanding the detente.

The policy of the American administration in no manner conforms to the responsibility which the United States, as one of the major powers, is called upon to bear for the maintenance of universal peace, the guaranteeing of the security of peoples, and mutually advantageous peaceful cooperation.

It is completely obvious that the zigzags taken by President Carter, forming the basis of which is the pressure exerted by the military-industrial complex, is in scandalous contradiction to the vital interests of the American people itself and to the cause of peace and universal security.

A serious, truly responsible approach to questions of guaranteeing international peace requires consistency, a weighed policy, the strict accounting of the present-day realities, the constructive search for the peaceful resolution to problems, the unconditional rejection of confrontation, and any kind of hegemonistic claims.

FOOTNOTES

1. R. Strausz-Hupe, W. Kintner, J. Dougherty, A. Cottrell, *Protracted Conflict*, New York, 1963, p 147.
2. *Personnel for the New Diplomacy*, New York, 1962, p 2.
3. R. Barnet, *The Giants: Russia and America*, New York, 1977, p 73.

4. See: R. Cooper, R. Kaiser, M. Kosaka, *Towards a Renovated International System: A Report to the Trilateral Commission*, New York, 1977, p 11.
5. *The Growing Dimensions of Security*, Washington, 1977, p 1.
6. *Ibid.*, pp 18-19.
7. The use of geographical or other similar terminology for the purpose of designating class and strictly political concepts in international relations is a typical method used by bourgeois political scientists. For example, the concept "East," which was used until quite recently in the racist-colonizer sense, is now equated with socialism, "West" is equated with capitalism, "North" with the developed capitalist and socialist countries, and "South" with the developing states. It is obvious that all these artificial schemes for opposing certain groups of countries to others, in essence, destroy the basis of the equal, mutually advantageous international cooperation.
8. PRAVDA, 15 December 1979.
9. PRAVDA, 19 JUNE 1979.
10. See: S. Brown, "A Cooling-Off Period for U.S.-Soviet Relations" (FOREIGN POLICY, 1977, p 21).
11. See: G. Ball, *Diplomacy for a Crowded World: An American Foreign Policy*, New York, 1977, p 317.
12. G. Kennan, *The Cloud of Danger*, Boston, 1977, p 48.
13. See: FOREIGN POLICY, Winter 1976-1977, pp 109-110.
14. WASHINGTON POST, 7 November 1977.
15. See: MILLENIUM: JOURNAL OF INTERNATIONAL STUDIES, No 1, 1978, p 62.
16. See: *Detente or Debacle*, New York, 1979.
17. *Defending America: Towards a New Role in the Post-Detente World*, New York, 1977, p 24.
18. *Detente*, Ed. by C. R. Urban, New York, 1976, p 187.
19. FOREIGN AFFAIRS, January 1977, p 333.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1980.

5075

CSO: 1800

INTERNATIONAL

CHINESE EXPANSION IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

Moscow MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODNYYE OTNOSHENIYA in Russian
No 2, 1980 signed to press 29 Jan 80

[Article by N. Yur'yev: "Kampuchea and Beijing's Strategy in Southeast Asia"]

[Text] Slightly more than a year has passed since the people of Kampuchea, at the cost of tremendous sacrifices, threw off the fetters of the executor's regime and began to cure the wounds that are difficult to heal, wounds that were inflicted upon that people by the government of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique. As newer and newer facts appear concerning the crimes committed by the Beijing puppets and their henchmen, who methodically carried out a policy of genocide with regard to their own nation, and who attempted to return the country to the era of barbarism, mankind becomes more and more clearly aware of the frightening scope of the destruction of the population of Kampuchea, and the true sources and causes of its national tragedy.

The progressive people on our planet, all those who hold dear the ideals of humanitarianism and democracy, peace, and social progress, are well aware of who the directors and the actors are in this bloody drama, which attests to the fact that the West has not yet given up its misanthropic ideology and policy. As for the scenario of the Kampuchea tragedy, it was prepared -- and this is known for certain at the present time -- far beyond the confines of Kampuchea. Evaluating the events in that country, L. I. Brezhnev pointed out that "a pro-Beijing regime existed there, so to speak, a Chinese model of political structure, and the mass annihilation of people in Kampuchea is nothing else but the Chinese 'cultural revolution' in action on other people's territory."

The Pol Pot clique, thus, represented an export version of Maoism -- a doctrine nurtured on shameless great Khan chauvinism with its unrestrained expansionistic strivings, and its territorial claims upon neighboring countries and peoples. The limits of the Beijing hegemonism are clearly drawn in the famous formula of the "great helmsman" -- our object is the entire world." This, obviously, is a long-term goal, which is subdivided

into individual tasks that are subordinated to the solution of the principal strategic task.

I

One of the component parts of Beijing's global strategy is the mastery of Southeast Asia (SEA) [in Russian, YuVA]. This region, since time immemorial, has been viewed by the rulers of China, who called themselves "sons of the heaven and rulers of the earth," as the patrimony of the "Celestial Empire." As though echoing the Chinese emperors, Mao, as early as August 1965, at a session of the Politburo of the Central Committee of the CPC [Communist Party of China; in Russian, KPK], stated, "We must definitely acquire Southeast Asia, including South Vietnam, Thailand, Burma, Malaysia, Singapore. . . Such a region as Southeast Asia is very rich. It has many natural resources and it extremely merits the expenditures to acquire it. In the future, that region will be very beneficial for the development of Chinese industry. Thus, it will be possible to make up any losses completely"¹.

It is easy to note that, although the posing of the task, the justification of the goals, and even the terminology here are very similar to those of the colonial predators of the era of the fierce struggle for overseas territories, we are dealing with a specific phenomenon which could be designated as "Maocolonialism." Its peculiarities consist in that the Beijing politicians have extended a broad struggle for the seizure and assimilation of other people's land under completely new historical conditions -- during the period of the collapse of the shameful colonial system of imperialism and the complete discreditation of the very idea of the establishment of dominance over other countries and peoples.

Thus, the primary goal that was formulated was expansion into the countries of Southeast Asia. However, the situation in that region differs radically from the situation when that region was the object of the colonial expansion of the European powers. At the present time, nine sovereign states exist here as members of the international community who are ready to defend their independence. But in Beijing the attempt is being made to adapt to the changed conditions, changing the tactics and varying the means of carrying out the expansion. At one time the emphasis was placed on crowding out of SEA the imperialism of the United States and the other Western powers, the subordination to Chinese influence of the region's communist and workers' movement, and the overthrowing of the governments in those countries which had started to move along the capitalistic path. Within the framework of the carrying out of these tasks, China rendered assistance to the peoples of Vietnam and the other countries of Indochina in repelling the imperialistic aggression, striving simultaneously to use the assistance that was granted as a means of establishing control over Vietnam and the subsequent conversion of it into a tool for its own expansion in SEA. It was precisely during that period that Malaysia was called in Beijing nothing else but a "neocolonialistic formation," the

Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) was knocked together, and objections were raised to the idea of creating a peace zone in SEA.

Now the friends have been changed into enemies, and Beijing is intensively forcing its friendship upon its former opponents. It is proposed, for example, to the United States that that country retain its military presence in the region. Appeals are issued to the member countries in the Association to create a "single front of China and ASEAN" for the purpose of combatting "hegemonism and minihegemonism" (as the Chinese leaders call the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and Vietnam, a policy which is aimed at the guaranteeing of peace and security). Quite recently, Beijing called Thailand "the lackey of American imperialism" as a result of its participation in the aggression war waged by the United States against the peoples of Indochina, but now aid is being offered importunately to that country in the event of the attack allegedly being made upon it by the SRV [Socialist Republic of Vietnam]. The Maoist leadership is intensively cultivating the state and political figures of other ASEAN countries also, by attempting to intimidate them with the "Vietnamese danger."

The buildup by China of the "power" and political pressure upon Vietnam and the other countries of Indochina encounters the approval on the part of the United States and the other imperialistic powers. This is not surprising if one considers the fact that Beijing is traveling along a road that was well-trodden by the American imperialism in its day. It is precisely the tentacles of American imperialism which left their mark forever at the early stages of the tragedy that overtook the Kampuchean nation. We might recall the end of the 1960's, when the United States, which was bogged down, up to its ears, in the Vietnamese adventure, in the search for a way out of its inglorious undertaking, shifted military actions to the territory of Cambodia. In March 1969 the barbaric order to bomb the peaceful, neutral state was issued. Over a period of more than four years the aggressors' aircraft methodically and coldbloodedly annihilated the country's population. The United States forced upon Cambodia the pro-imperialistic Lon Nol regime and then sent to that country the interventionistic troops of its Saigon puppets. As a result of the bombings and the bestialities perpetrated by the interventionists, more than 600,000 Kampucheans perished. Is that a large number or a small number for a state with a population of 8 million? So the Maoists, following in the footsteps of the American aggressors in Indochina, were able only to outswagger them, but not to outstrip them.

At the present time the SRV is viewed in Beijing as China's enemy No. 1 in Southeast Asia, just as the USSR is considered to be its chief opponent on a global scale. Does this attest to the fact that the Beijing leadership has rejected the goals proclaimed by Mao with respect to Southeast Asia as a whole? By no means. The fact of the matter is that socialist Vietnam, by defending its sovereignty and opposing Beijing's expansionistic strivings, has now become the basic hindrance on the path of China's expansionistic encroachments. Thus, the advances being made by Beijing to the ASEAN countries have the goal initially of isolating Vietnam in the

region and then, after putting it on its knees, continuing to carry out Beijing's plans for the establishment of control over Southeast Asia as a whole.

Currently the propaganda apparatus of the CPR [Chinese People's Republic] is attempting in every way to distort the true content of the policy of the SRV in Southeast Asia, to prescribe to Vietnam aggressive intentions with respect to its neighboring states. In a parallel manner, Washington is intimidating the governments of the countries in that region with the "domino theory," according to which the SEA states allegedly will fall, one after the other, under the control of Vietnam, just as domino tiles fall in sequence if you stand them up in a row and then push the first one. In harmony with this "theory" are the accusations that have been issuing from Beijing against Vietnam, to the effect that Vietnam is striving to establish its hegemony in SEA by creating an "Indochinese federation" consisting of SRV, LNDR [Laotian People's Democratic Republic], and NKR [People's Republic of Kampuchea].

Actually it is not Vietnam, but Beijing, which is harboring plans -- and has been harboring them for a long time -- to master not only Indochina, but also of Southeast Asia. It is precisely China, rather than any other country, that has been making territorial claims on other states, even to those which, it would seem, are situated far from China. The CPR claims not only a part of the territory of Burma, Laos, and SRV, but also the island situated on the coast of the Philippines and Malaysia. Thus, the Beijing politicians consider the most southerly extremity of China to be the Tsengmu reef, which is only 20 miles from the coast of the Malaysian state of Sarawak. Practically speaking, almost all the islands in the South China Sea are viewed by them as component parts of the territory of the CPR, and the sea itself is viewed as nothing more than an intra-Chinese lake.

In the light of this, it becomes easy to discern the true reasoning behind Beijing's position in the question of regulating the passage of foreign ships through the Malacca and Singapore straits. Renunciation of the freedom of international maritime navigation through these straits, and the introduction of various limitations which the Maoists have attempted to achieve would undoubtedly facilitate substantially the Chinese expansion in the southerly direction, since the coastal countries (Vietnam, Kampuchea, Thailand, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, and the Philippines) would prove to be face to face with a state which has at its disposal a naval fleet that is fourth in the world with regard to the number of vessels and has already used arms to confirm its territorial claims in this region. (Suffice it to recall here the seizure of the Parasel Islands in 1974.)

For penetration into Southeast Asia, Beijing is using more and more actively the rather numerous Chinese communities that exist there. The people in the ruling circles of the ASEAN countries are beginning to realize this. Vice-President of Indonesia A. Malik stated, for example, that

it is not Vietnam, but China, which represents an immediate threat to the SEA states, since it has already "stuck its foot" into the door of the ASEAN five with the aid of "hua qiao." Although in most of the Association's member states the Chinese population, from the point of view of percentage, represents the minority, it in essence controls their economy, especially the sphere of finance and domestic and foreign trade. The communities of local Chinese play an important role in foreign political life, and also in the formation of the foreign policy of those countries. As the economic cooperation within the framework of ASEAN becomes more smoothly organized, the influence of the "hua qiao" on the foreign-policy course of the Association has been increasing as a whole. Obviously, many Chinese living in the countries of Southeast Asia are completely aware of the criminal nature of Beijing's expansionistic plans. But they also include those who thoughtlessly have yielded to great-power intentions.

The gradual "Sinicizing" of the ASEAN from within -- by means of the Chinese communities -- and from without -- by means of pressure, threats, and intimidation, in combination with diplomatic curtsies and hypocritical assertions of "eternal friendship" -- is what is counted on in Beijing as it "reorganizes" its relations with the Association. In the ASEAN countries certain official circles sometimes express the satisfaction with the fact that China now recognizes the Association and has an approving attitude toward its activities. It would be strange if Beijing, at the present stage in the carrying out of its hegemonistic strivings against SEA, did not support the idea of economic cooperation on a regional basis, because this line does not contradict the initial plan -- to make the transition from the control of the communities of "hua qiao" over the economy of individual SEA countries to the coordination of the actions of Chinese big business within the framework of the entire Association. The Maoists are not the least embarrassed by the differences in the socioeconomic structure of the CPR and the ASEAN countries, because the political consequences of the intensification of the economic positions of the Chinese communities in SEA are evaluated by the Beijing leaders in an unambiguous manner.

True, people in Beijing prefer to say very little about this at the present time. But during the period when China's relations with the countries that are currently members of the Association were at a different phase in their development, the Maoists did not conceal their true intentions. For example, as long ago as 1960 the then Minister of Foreign Affairs of CPR, Chan Yi stated in a discussion with representatives of "hua qiao" from Vietnam who had visited Beijing that "90 percent of the population of Singapore are Chinese; with a population of slightly more than a million people, Chinese constitute more than 900,000. Therefore Singapore represents a country that was created in that region by Chinese"².

The current wooing of the ASEAN countries by Beijing by no means signifies that there has been a renunciation there of the "forceful" resolution of the question of establishing its control over them. In most of these

states the Maoists have at their disposal underground political organizations and armed formations which pose as their task the overthrowing of the existing governments. The political premises and actions of the pro-Beijing organizations and militarized detachments are extremely similar to the tactics of the Pol Pot forces during the period of their fight for power in Cambodia. Numerous indications attest to the fact that these are not national organizations, but a Maoist agent network that has been introduced into the SEA countries. In particular, it is known that the pro-Beijing organization in Thailand, on the basis of an order from "Celestial," has currently ceased its antigovernmental actions temporarily and has been mobilized to render assistance to the remnants of the Pol Pot gangs that are hiding on Thai territory. One can, however, have no doubt that in the near future, when the hopelessness of using the Pol Pot forces in Kampuchea becomes obvious even to Beijing, their ranks will be annexed to the Maoist formations in Thailand for the purpose of resolving the tasks of Chinese policy in that country.

Thus, the primary strategic task of Beijing is the mastery of the entire region. Why, then, has Kampuchea proved to be on the very curring edge of the Chinese expansion in SEA? What encourages Beijing even now, after its obvious defeat, to continue to grab at that country, to attempt to use it in its political game in Southeast Asia?

II

By late 1974 and early 1975 Cambodia was the weakest link in the chain of the pro-American regimes in SEA. It was obvious that the puppet government of Lon Nol was living out its last days. At that time, unlike the situation in the patriotic movement of South Vietnam and Laos, the leadership of the Khmer Rouge, which headed the anti-imperialistic, liberation struggle being waged by the Cambodian nation, was heterogeneous. It consisted of three basic trends: 1) a grouping of political figures who occupied positions of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and who had graduated from the school of revolutionary struggle in the ranks of the Communist Party of Indochina (which was disbanded in 1951), and who had maintained close ties with its other detachments; 2) the Pol Pot and Ieng Sary grouping, which represented a direct Maoist agent network in the movement; and 3) a small group of political figures which one can arbitrarily call "neutralist." It was with a consideration specifically of these circumstances -- the weakness of the Lon Nol regime, on the one hand, and the heterogeneity of the leadership of the patriotic forces, on the other -- that the Maoists selected Cambodia as the chief sector for their expansion.

The operation of promoting its proteges to power in the country was carried out by Beijing with unprecedented insidiousness. The striving of the Chinese leaders to place Cambodia under their control was so strong that they unscrupulously flirted with all the political currents in the country. After the pro-American military junta in 1970, Beijing immediately

established secret contacts with Lon Nol and attempted to incline Vietnam to this also. For example, a representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the CPR at that time told the ambassador of the DRV to CPR, "Sihanouk is not supported by any forces whatsoever. Vietnam should support Lon Nol. China welcomes Sihanouk's visit (at that time Sihanouk was en route to Beijing), but continues to maintain good relations with the embassy of Phnom Penh"³. Simultaneously the Maoists preserved contacts with the Khmer enigres in Paris.

When it became completely obvious that the overall situation in Cambodia as a result of the successes achieved by the Vietnamese Resistance and the efforts of the Kampuchean revolutionaries had changed fundamentally in favor of the patriotic forces, and the collapse of the Lon Nol regime had become a matter of time, the Chinese leaders finally put their reliance upon Pol Pot and Ieng Sary.

The brunt of the liberation struggle in Cambodia was borne on the shoulders of the country's patriotic forces, which relied upon the fraternal assistance of SRV. The decision role played by Vietnamese assistance in the victory over the puppet government of Lon Nol was repeatedly recognized by Pol Pot and those surrounding him. For example, during the Vietnamese-Kampuchean negotiations in Hanoi in June 1975, Pol Pot stated that "without the assistance and support of the Party of Workers of Vietnam, the Vietnamese armed forces, and the population, as well as the peoples of the world and especially the Vietnamese people, we could not have won such a victory. . ."⁴.

On 17 April 1975 the Khmer Rouge troops entered Phnom Penh and other cities that remained under control of the puppet regime. They entered without any combat since the Lon Nol army, acting on the order of General Staff officers who had remained in Phnom Penh and of the patriarch of the Buddhist community, Samdek Huot That, ceased resistance everywhere. According to many witnesses, there existed a large difference between the behavior of of the subdivisions that were the first to enter Phnom Penh and those young soldiers, dressed all in black, who began to enter the city several hours later. Whereas the former had behaved, on the whole, loyally with respect to the peaceful population and do not commit any excesses, the "little lads in black," upon occupying the key highways and intersections in the city and seizing the most important buildings and the weapons depots, immediately began to evict absolutely all the inhabitants from the capital, using their weapons at the slightest sign of disobedience. Subsequently it became known that the Pol Pot forces, upon entering Phnom Penh, had immediately eliminated those leading Khmer Rouge figures who adhered to views differing with their own, and devoted their principal attention to eradicating everything that might recall cooperation with Vietnam.

These details are cited for the purpose of showing that the Pol Pot regime sprang up as a result of the perfidy and insidiousness of the pro-Beijing grouping, its treason to the country's revolutionary forces, and Beijing's crude interference into the internal affairs of Kampuchea. Thus,

the Pol Pot regime from the very beginning was illegal, since the Maoist agent network deprived the Kampuchean nation of the fruits of the victory that had been won by that nation in the anti-imperialistic, liberation struggle. If it had not been for the intrigues of the Maoists, the Kampuchean nation would not have had to experience those sufferings that became its lot during the years of rule by the criminal clique.

All the deeds of the Pol Pot regime attest to the fact that it consciously and in a planned manner carried out a course that had been developed by its protectors, a course aimed at the annihilation of the Khmer nation, at "clearing the ground" for the subsequent settlement of the country by Chinese, and the conversion of Kampuchea either into a vassal state in conformity with the traditional views of the Chinese emperors, or simply into a province of China. The Maoist plan of "clearing" Kampuchea of its indigenous population for the subsequent assimilation of its territory by Chinese harmonizes with Beijing's line on the international scene, which is aimed at provoking a worldwide thermonuclear conflict, plunging mankind into catastrophe, and, on the ruins of modern civilization, creating a new -- and, obviously, "Chinese" -- civilization. "If half of mankind is destroyed," the "great helmsman" prophesied, "then half will still remain. . .," and then he added that "the Chinese nation does not fear a new world war."

That which was carried out in Kampuchea by the Maoist experiment, which had been greatly worked up by the maniacal zeal of the executors, was confirmed by no one else but Pol Pot himself. On 29 September 1977, speaking at a reception in Beijing in honor of Hua Guofen, he stated, in particular, that "Chairman Mao and the Chinese nation have supplied us with that which is the most valuable thing for the carrying out of the revolution in Kampuchea, namely, the ideology of Mao Zedong. Developing that idea at a press conference that was held the same day, Pol Pot said, "We studied the experience of world revolution, especially the works of Comrade Mao Zedong and the experience of the Chinese revolution, which exerted an extremely important effect upon us. On the basis of. . . the study of the experience of the revolution in various countries, especially under the influence of the works of Comrade Mao, we determined the path corresponding to the situation and to the concrete conditions of Kampuchea"⁵.

We might recall briefly the exact nature of this "path" that had been chosen "under the influence of the works of Mao" and that was presented as the construction of some kind of new "classless" society by means of the "most radical revolution," carried out under the slogans of "complete independence, sovereignty," "support by our own forces," etc. This camouflage was needed by the Maoists in order to conceal the true essence of Beijing's policy in Southeast Asia and the methods of carrying it out. However, the bestialities against one's own nation, the betraying of one's national interests, do not cease to be such even if, for purposes of concealing them, one employs the most refined verbal gymnastics. At the present time, when the screen of cynical phraseology that shrouded Kampuchea

has been lifted, the peoples of Southeast Asia -- and not only those peoples -- are able, on the basis of its pitiful example, to see clearly what would await them in the future if the fanatic experiment had not been disrupted and the path of Maoist expansion had not been blocked this time.

What are the results of the more than three-year rule by the Beijing henchmen in Kampuchea? Here they are. During that period the Pol Pot clique annihilated 3 million people, or almost every second inhabitant of the country. Prior to that, not a single one of the bloodthirstiest regimes known to history had succeeded in achieving such "results." But they did not have any intentions of stopping with this. Pol Pot stated outright that for the construction of a "new Kampuchea" one million "pure citizens" were sufficient, that is, approximately 3 million additional persons were to be liquidated.

The Pol Pot clique began their violent actions immediately after hacking their way to power. The first people to be subjected to immediate annihilation were the Lon Nol army -- from general to soldier -- as well as the officials in the state apparatus, the propertied segments, and the representatives of the intellectual class. The violence was not an act of vengeance or improvisation on the part of certain individuals among the administrative workers in the Khmer Rouge. The destruction of the population throughout the country was carried out in accordance with a single scenario that had been developed even before the seizure of power, although there were slight variations in individual regions. For example, several hours after the entry of the Pol Pot troops into Phnom Penh, the inhabitants were told to leave the city under the pretext that American planes were approaching the capital and might begin at any moment to bomb it. In Battambang, the second largest city in the country, the officers in the Lon Nol army, the representatives of the administration, the intellectual class, and the propertied segments were told to depart for Phnom Penh "for the purpose of meeting the head of state, Norodom Sihanouk." The people going to that "meeting" were loaded onto trucks, driven several dozen kilometers from Battambang, and then killed by machinegun fire. In the small city of Pailin the radio carried the following announcement, directed at officers in the old army, "Comrades, we ask you to help the revolutionary organization. We ask you to go to Battambang to teach our soldiers how to drive tanks and how to operate radios. Upon leaving the city, those people were annihilated. Approximately the same scheme was used everywhere.

Apart from the massive purges and murders that continued for the entire period of rule by the Pol Pot regime, a large number of people perished during the forced evacuations of the cities and the systematic resettlements of the inhabitants of the country from one place to another. The shuffling of the population, in particular the evacuation of the inhabitants of Phnom Penh was explained by the leaders of the regime by the necessity of preventing what they claimed would be inevitable starvation. "We estimated the size of the population of Phnom Penh to be 2 million persons, but when we entered the city, we discovered almost 3 million,"

Ieng Sary said shiftily. ". . . Thus, the population was supposed to go for subsistence to where the food supplies were more than sufficient"⁶. It turns out that this barbaric action was committed, practically speaking, for humanitarian purposes. Why, then, was it necessary to conduct the entire operation of evacuating the tremendous city in one or two days when, according to testimony given by witnesses, the supplies of rice in the capital would have been sufficient for no less than two months with efficient consumption⁷.

Certain people sometimes express the opinion that during the period of the Pol Pot regime an attempt was made to carry out in practice the famous Maoist thesis concerning the surrounding of the city by the village in an unusual interpretation. This is also substantiated by the references to the student projects of Khieu Samphan and other leading figures in the regime, which extolled the organization of society in the Angkor Empire, which reached its peak in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Others, on the contrary, feel that the Khmer Rouge attempted to implement a concept of society in accordance with which the city as such was supposed to disappear. References are made at such time to half-baked judgments made by the Pol Pot apprentices, with the following content, for example: "The city is poor because there is money in the city. You can remake people, but you cannot remake a city"⁸.

But in actuality no one had destroyed the city. It was as though a neutron bomb had exploded: the buildings were still intact, but hundreds of thousands of their owners continued to lie lifeless alongside the roads, having failed to withstand the exhausting trip under the burning sun and the barrels of submachine guns, without food, water, or medical assistance. If the goal being sought was to "peasantize" the entire population, why, then, was it necessary, for example, to herd like cattle 1.5 million peasants who, by the spring of 1975, had gathered in Phnom Penh and who rushed to return to the land as soon as the military actions were over? It can be assumed -- although with large stipulations -- that a few of the activists in the middle and lower levels of the Khmer Rouge did not know what they were doing when they put their faith in the maxims concerning the cities, as evoked by Maoism. But the higher leaders knew what they were dealing with -- and it was not the annihilation of cities, but the liquidation of their inhabitants.

The entire country was turned into a tremendous concentration camp, and forced labor from dawn to dusk was introduced. Practically speaking, no agricultural tools were used. Everything was done by hand. Moreover, the individual output norms exceeded the person's physical capabilities. Many people who were not accustomed to peasant labor, naturally, were unable to fulfill the norms and died of overexertion or under the blows of the overseers, who punished them for the slightest nonfulfillment of the norm. Cambodia in the past had exported foodstuffs and it would have seemed that when the entire population was driven out onto the fields,

there should have been sufficient food products. However, according to the testimony of refugees, in a number of places in mid-1975 each person was issued 180 grams of rice for two days. At first people were authorized to go into the forest and gather edible leaves, roots, etc., to increase the food ration, but subsequently these searches were discontinued as a result of a ban imposed by the authorities, and, in addition, many people simply did not have the strength to do this⁹.

A process that was carried out in parallel with this was the destruction of the modern public-health system which had been created over a period of decades by the efforts of the local and foreign, including Soviet, medical workers. Its elimination caused recurrences of many infectious diseases which previously had been mostly conquered. The complete destruction of the system for purifying the water led to the unprecedentedly widespread occurrence of gastrointestinal and skin diseases.

The combination of massive repressions, forced labor, systematic malnutrition, diseases, and constant fear for one's life led millions of people to their grave, and led those who survived to extreme physical and mental exhaustion. There arose the real threat of the complete disappearance of the Khmer nation. Justifying the murders, the Khmer Rouge used arguments of the following type: "It is better to kill one innocent person than to leave an enemy alive" or "Preserving their life is of no advantage, and taking their life is no loss." Sometimes the members of the Pol Pot regime called murdering a person "sending him to make fertilizer"¹⁰.

An apparatus was created and improved for managing the gigantic extermination process. It consisted of the "Angka" -- the organization in the name of which all illegalities were committed -- a widely ramified network of overseers, spies, and hangmen. A new -- or, as the Pol Pot regime called it, "pure" -- "race" was being formed, from among the young people who were not burdened by any knowledge and who were ready to execute blindly any order issued by the "Angka" within the country or outside it.

In an atmosphere of a kind of bacchanalia of death there was furiously carried out a "cultural revolution" according to the Beijing model, but with the sole difference that in Kampuchea the goal of that revolution, everything else apart, was to eradicate from people's memory everything linked with Kampuchean history, culture, and the age-old traditions of the nation. A person who was seen to be holding a piece of paper or a pencil was doomed. "The first people I killed were those who were wearing eyeglasses," a former agent in the Pol Pot secret police admitted. An American magazine NATIONAL REVIEW wrote that no one had ever managed in such a short period of time "to completely erase, to destroy an old social structure of a country, its economy, culture, and customs, and to pull out by the roots any incipient sign of free thought, of independent thinking. Books and archives were burned. Pagodas, statues of Buddha, museums -- everything was destroyed and ground into the dirt. . . . The authorities are attempting to eliminate everything, down to the last trace, of the spiritual life of the nation, every memory of it. Even the famous ancient

temples were wiped off the face of the earth so that no one was left with any recollections about the past"¹¹. All this corresponded to the logic of the Maoists and their local stooges: if the territory situated between Vietnam, Laos, and Thailand was being prepared to become a province of China, then who needed memories about something called Kampuchea?

The country was supposed to be converted into one of the basic rice granaries of China. Under the slogans "become the bosses of the land and the water, the rice paddies and fields, the forests and all vegetation," "the master of the problem of water and annual floods," and "the master of nature," practically the entire population was thrown into the growing of rice, the assimilation of new land for that crop, and the construction of irrigation structures.

Step by step, everything was destroyed -- Kampuchean society, its foundations, the traditional and modern components of civilization. The economic ties were broken both within the country and with the outside world. The very idea of commodity-monetary relations was being eradicated. All educational institutions were closed and textbooks were burned. Actually, why teach reading and writing to those who have been denied the right to live? The traditional concept of the family was abolished: if it was the fate of the entire nation to expire, then one should not allow the Kampuchians to reproduce their own kind uncontrollably. Although the constitution of "democratic Kampuchea" proclaims the right to perform religious rites, all cult institutions and their priests were destroyed.

That is how the infrastructure was being formed for the acceptance of resettlers from the "Celestial Kingdom," of whom no less than 10 million persons were expected¹². But that was not the only goal that Beijing set for the Pol Pot regime.

III

The second very important goal of the Maoists with respect to "democratic Kampuchea" consisted in converting it into a staging area for the expansion in Indochina. With the aid of the Pol Pot regime, states the White Paper of the SRV Ministry of Foreign Affairs entitled "The Truth About Vietnamese-Chinese Relations During the Past 30 Years," "the Chinese attempted to control all of Kampuchea, to convert it into a new type of Chinese satellite and into a military base for attacking Vietnam from the southwest"¹³.

The scheme for carrying out this plan looked as follows. The primary task of the Chinese ruling upper class consisted in besmirching socialist Vietnam in the eyes of world public opinion, and in presenting in a distorted form its peace-loving foreign policy. Therefore, after setting its stooges against SRV, Beijing extended a broad propaganda campaign with the purpose of making Vietnam look as though it was acting the role of the aggressor, Kampuchea the victim, and China, its defender. The intention was simple -- politically naive persons would sooner think that it was large Vietnam (50 million people) that had attacked small Kampuchea (5 million people) than believe the truth concerning the aggression of

"democratic Kampuchea" against a neighboring country. Especially since the thesis advanced by the Maoists -- the thesis of Vietnam's "aggressiveness," and its striving to create an "Indochinese federation" -- was, as it were, confirmed by the "domino theory" that was being intensively disseminated by imperialistic propaganda.

In actuality, just two weeks after the seizure of Phnom Penh the armed forces of the Pol Pot regime began military operations against the SRV. On 1 May 1975 subdivisions of the Khmer Rouge invaded Vietnamese territory in several border regions from Hatien to Tainin. On 4 May of the same year they landed on Fukuok Island, and on 10 May they seized Thotiu Island. "Democratic Kampuchea" rejected the repeated proposals from the SRV government concerning the settlement of the border problems. On the contrary, the Maoist stooges in Phnom Penh added fuel to the anti-Vietnamese hysteria, incited the Kampuchean's hatred of the Vietnamese, and announced the necessity of liberating the "ancient lands," including Saigon, which was allegedly occupied by Vietnam.

Beijing did everything to heat up the anti-Soviet feelings among its Phnom Penh stooges and to arm them. In February 1976 Beijing concluded with them a treaty by which China granted aid to Kampuchea in the area of arms and military technology. That treaty stipulated the delivery in 1976-1978 of a large amount of various kinds of military technology, equipment, and ammunition¹⁴. The Beijing ruling upper class at first at meetings with members of the Pol Pot regime, and then publicly, began to announce the "complete support" by China of the "just struggle being waged by the Kampuchean nation." For the immediate guidance of the military actions against the SRV, Beijing sent to Phnom Penh 20,000 of its military advisors and specialists.

Moreover the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique threw into the fire of the border war newer and newer thousands of warriors, armed with Chinese weapons, invariably stamped with "800" (which was supposed to remind the Khmer Rouge constantly that they were backed up by the 800 million people in China and that they had nothing to fear from the 50 million people in Vietnam). By May 1978 the military psychosis of the Phnom Penh rulers reached its peak. On 10 May they announced over Radio Phnom Penh: "As of the present moment we have achieved our goal: to replace one by 30, that is, for every murdered Khmer we are killing 30 Vietnamese. Thus, it is necessary to sacrifice only 2 million Khmers and we will succeed in annihilating more than 50 million Vietnamese"¹⁵.

In December 1978 the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique, having concentrated on the Kampuchean-Vietnamese border 19 infantry divisions (out of the 23 available), attacked the city of Benshoi (Tainin Province), which is situated 100 kilometers from Saigon. After putting into action its best divisions, supported by tanks and artillery, it set as its goal the rapid seizure of the center of Tainin Province and thus the preparation for the deep invasion into South Vietnam¹⁶. However, what was even more dangerous was the fact that by the end of 1978 Beijing had drawn up to the Vietnamese

border 600,000 soldiers and was preparing to invade Vietnam. In this instance the SRV would have had to fight on two fronts -- on the north and the southwest -- and, if necessary, the Maoists could have easily sent their troops into Kampuchea under the guise of its "protection against Vietnamese aggression" and could have dealt a blow at Ho Chih Minh City, in a suburb of which -- Sholon -- 600,000 "hua qiao" were living.

Apart from everything else, Kampuchea was a kind of test range where the Maoists "road-tested" the forms and methods of seizing power, as well as their scheme for converting the country that had fallen into the orbit of Chinese hegemonism from a formally independent country into a territory which the Vietnamese newspaper NYAN ZAN characterized as "a new type of colony." It was also used as a staging area for Chinese expansion into the countries of Southeast Asia. From there Beijing was exerting pressure upon the government of Thailand. The Pol Pot clique not only waged a border war against Vietnam, but also constantly provoked conflicts on the border with Thailand, so that its government sensed the close breathing of Beijing and was more eager to make concessions to it in the hope that it would restrain its immoderately zealous Kampuchean puppet.

In addition, the Chinese leadership, which was not too interested in advertising its links with the pro-Beijing organizations in the ASEAN countries and Burma, entrusted some of the tasks of controlling them to the members of the Pol Pot regime. This is attested to by the documents that were seized during the destruction of the headquarters of the traitors to the Kampuchean people. Here is an excerpt from the record of a conversation that was held on 29 September 1977, in which the participants included, on the Chinese side, Hua Guofeng, Deng Xiaoping, Li Xianyan, and Geng Biao, and, on the Kampuchean side, Pol Pot, Ieng Sary, and Volvet. Pol Pot reports to his bosses, "We exchanged opinions and came to an agreement with our Burmese, Malaysian, Indonesian, and Thai friends. This is a great political achievement. The concretization of the understanding, obviously, is still a complicated matter, especially when you go into the details of it. But from the north we have the support of our Chinese friends. In Southeast Asia there exists unanimity, and this is the strategic moment which inspires us very much . . . We are striving to collect into a single entity all the forces in Southeast Asia, viewing this as an important condition for final victory. We also believed earlier in that victory. But now, having the support of our Chinese friends, we believe in it even more. Recently the 11th Congress of the Communist Party of China even commended us, and the revolution in Southeast Asia will have

The SEA nations can be convinced, by viewing the example of the much-suffering Kampuchea, of what consequences the dissemination of this "revolution," modeled after the experience of the Maoists, could lead to.

IV

However, the plans of the Chinese hegemonists and their proteges were not

fated to be carried out. Despite the fiercest terror, the Kampuchean nation arose to the struggle against the clique of traitors and their Beijing bosses. That struggle was headed by the patriotically-minded civil and military cadres of the Communist Party of Kampuchea, who managed to avoid annihilation. As the liberation struggle unfolded, the officers in the Pol Pot army began to switch over to the side of the people, realizing that the regime was leading the nation to ruin. The first attempts to render resistance to the Pol Pot government were made in mid-1975. With the passage of time they took on an increasingly organized nature and broader scope.

In September 1976 there was an uprising in one of the districts located 7 kilometers from the city of Battambang. Riots also encompassed the northern military districts, in particular Oddar-Mientai, Kompong-Thom, and Siem-Reap. The authorities brutally suppressed these demonstrations. The local leaders were accused of "treason" and were sentenced to death by being burned at the stake at the city stadium. The center of the uprisings gradually shifted to eastern military district No. 203. Here the Pol Pot forces, having encountered dissatisfaction within their own armed forces, were forced to disarm the 73rd Battalion of the 21st Infantry Regiment. Two weeks later they arrested 100 soldiers and officers in that military unit, most of whom were Communists and members of the Komsomol. Then came the turn of the 33rd, 55th, and 59th Battalions of the same regiment. In June 1977 the entire command element of the regiment, including commander Chan Hol and commissar Sok Sat, were taken away to an unknown destination.

In late May 1978 the situation in military district No. 203 reached its culmination. The person who headed the uprising there was the deputy chief of state, secretary of the regional party committee, and chief of staff of the military district, So Phim. On 25 May So Phim issued the order to take the offensive in zone 21. The partisan warfare gradually spread across the entire country. The combat engagements were of a particularly ferocious nature in the areas of Suong, Chun, Preiveng, and Kompongcham. In May of the same year the deputy chief of staff of the zone and member of its party committee Heng Samrin took control of the uprising in the Eastern Military Zone. In November he appealed to the population of the Eastern Zone and the entire country to rise up in the struggle against the hated regime of genocide.

The existence of opposition to the regime was repeatedly recognized by Phnom Penh radio, which called for the stern punishment of the "traitors." The opposition was also mentioned by Pol Pot himself in a discussion with Hua Guofeng on 29 September 1977. "During our previous meeting early this year, Chairman Hua Guofeng emphasized the existence in our country of a group of opposition forces. I confirm that. Spies have penetrated our ranks under various guises. There exist three large enemy networks. . ."

By the end of 1978 the riots have spread to practically the entire country. On 2 December the leaders of individual insurgent detachments held a

conference in one of the liberated regions of the country, with the participation of representatives of various segments of the population. That conference adopted the decision to create the United Front for the National Salvation of Kampuchea (YeFN8K). The congress approved a declaration concerning the goals and tasks of the Kampuchean revolution, which declaration contained an appeal to the nation to unite itself and to arise in the common struggle to overthrow the reactionary clique of Pol Pot and Ieng Sary in the interests of creating a peaceful, independent, democratic, neutral, and nonaligned Kampuchea, which is building socialism. The uprising that was carried out by the Kampuchean nation in the name of the salvation of their homeland was crowned with victory. On 7 January 1979 the troops of the patriotic forces entered Phnom Penh. On 8 January the People's Revolutionary Council was created. That council -- the republic's government -- presented a program manifesto to the people. In that manifesto it was stated that the dictatorial fascist regime of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary regime was being abolished. The People's Republic of Kampuchea was proclaimed.

As L. I. Brezhnev remarked, "the Kampuchean nation arose to the struggle against a regime that was hated by it, against a tyranny that had been forced upon the nation of Kampuchea from without. That is its right, and Soviet public opinion supports the just struggle waged by the nation of Kampuchea under the leadership of the United Front for National Salvation." Together with the Soviet Union, many other states and progressive people throughout the world welcomed the heroic victory won by the Kampuchean patriots. This was the obvious defeat of Chinese hegemonism, the importance of which goes far beyond the confines of Kampuchea. With the example of this victory, the SEA nations are convinced that Beijing's expansion can be stopped and the plans of the ruling upper class of China which were aimed at the gradual absorption of the countries in the region were disrupted.

Beijing, as well as many western countries whose ruling circles have been obviously encouraging the expansionistic course of the present rulers of China, lost no time in extending a broad campaign of slander against the Kampuchean revolution. Both the Beijing and the imperialistic propaganda systems asserted in a single voice that it was not the Kampuchean nation that has thrown off the yoke of the bloody regime, but that Vietnam had allegedly occupied Kampuchea. Unfortunately, a position that sometimes coincides objectively with this line is the position taken by definite political circles in the nonalignment movement, irrespective of their subjective intentions.

Meanwhile, the facts -- some of which have already been cited here -- incontrovertibly attest to the fact that the revolutionary anti-Maoist revolution in Kampuchea was carried out by the nation of that country itself. Confirmations of this can be encountered sometimes even on the pages of the bourgeois press. For example, the FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW, which it would be difficult to accuse of being sympathetic toward socialist Vietnam, wrote, "Intelligence data indicates that the simple

Kampuchean and many subdivisions in the Khmer Rouge army are happy to have thrown off the Pol Pot yoke. . . Entire subdivisions are crossing over to the side of the front (the United Front for National Salvation). There have been spontaneous and unconnected uprisings in the northern provinces both among the military and among the civilian populace. There is information to the effect that the peasants are cooperating with the new authorities in expelling from their regions the Khmer Rouge cadres, who are attempting to take root among the local populace"¹⁸.

As for Vietnam, it actually rendered support to the Kampuchean nation in its struggle against the pro-Beijing regime. Acting in accordance with their legal right to self-defense, the Vietnamese troops rebuffed the systematic armed hit-and-run attacks by the Pol Pot troops. By the end of 1978 the command element of the army of the puppet regime, according to plans that had been worked out in Beijing, concentrated along the Kampuchean-Vietnamese border three-fourths of all its available forces, preparing for a strike at the SRV jointly with the Chinese troops that had been brought up to the Vietnamese-Chinese border. As a result, a considerable part of Kampuchea, practically speaking, proved to be beyond the military control of the criminal regime. That circumstance substantially facilitated the execution by the Kampuchean patriots of their task of mobilizing the national resistance to the Pol Pot forces and of extending the new authority throughout the territory of the country. In addition, in early January 1979, striving to prevent Chinese aggression from two directions -- from the north, that is, from the territory of China itself, and from the south-west, from the direction of the Kampuchean staging area -- the Vietnamese troops struck a powerful blow at the Pol Pot army that was stretched out along the border, and that broke closer the inevitable end of the regime of genocide.

Censuring Vietnam for its support of the Kampuchean nation in its struggle against the proteges of the Maoists, as the famous British journalist (Dzh. Pildzher) justly wrote in NEW STATESMAN, is equivalent to censuring the "invasion" of the Allies into fascist Germany during World War II. One can have no doubt that when the propaganda dust that has been raised by the imperialistic circles and by Beijing has settled and the artificially incited passions have calmed down, many of those people who at the present time, closing their eyes to the true state of affairs, have been echoing Beijing will be eternally thankful to the Kampuchean patriots and to the brave people of Vietnam for having disrupted Beijing's expansionistic plans with regard to SEA.

The new, people's authority during the first year of its existence applied tremendous efforts to restore the country. The main emphasis was made on putting the life of the population on a normal keel, and placing a material basis as quickly as possible under the restored democratic rights of the nation.

After the liberation of the country, higher and local agencies of authority

were created. Obviously, the apparatus of administration has not been completely staffed, and the professional training of the existing personnel is inadequate. The damage inflicted by the criminal regime upon the nation is too great and the consequences of the management methods of that regime will be felt for a long time. But the most important thing here is that the new administrative agencies represent the power of the people, were elected by that people, and are reportable to it. The populace shows complete trust in the revolutionary leadership. In addition to this, work is being carried out to create such mass organizations as peasant, trade-union, youth, women's, and other organizations. All the organizations are members of the front and represent the interests of various segments of the population.

The Pol Pot-Teng Sary clique completely destroyed the country's economy, and threw it into a state of extraordinary ruin. As they fled to save themselves from just vengeance, the Pol Pot forces destroyed equipment at enterprises, technical documentation, and agricultural tools. The state to which the national economy was brought is attested to by the starvation that raged through all parts of the country prior to liberation. Even now it threatens the life of many of those who recently were saved from death and sufferings. Combatting that starvation, the revolutionary authority distributes among the population hundreds of thousands of tons of food-stuffs that are offered in the form of assistance by the Soviet Union, the SRV, and the other fraternal and friendly countries. The scope of this assistance is gradually increasing.

The state supplies the peasants with seeds and farm needs, although not yet in sufficient quantity. In the sphere of industry, despite the shortage of raw and other materials, fuel, etc., and of qualified personnel, more than 40 enterprises have been restored and activated. The people's authority rapidly organized the repair, clearing, and reopening of roads and rivers, as well as the seaport of Kampongseom, which has already begun to accept foreign ships. The operation of the railroad that links that port city with the capital of the country has been restored.

An object of special pride for the new authority is the rapid expansion of the areas planted to food crops. Whereas the first harvest of rice after victory was brought in from an area of only 50,000 hectares, during the autumn of 1970, 578,000 hectares were planted to rice, and 200,000 hectares to corn, manioc, and other crops. That means that the process of returning the peasants to their hometowns is coming to an end, and the foundations are being laid for resolving one of the most acute problems that have been inherited from the past -- the fight against the threat of starvation. Gradually the cities are coming back to life also. In Phnom Penh and in the suburbs, for example, there are already 200,000 inhabitants, or 10 times more than during the time of the Pol Pot regime.

At the present time the schools have been restored practically everywhere. More than 510,000 children attend these schools, and the schools employ 12,000 teachers, who are old and newly trained. The public-health system

is being revived. Twenty-five hospitals, 60 medical stations, and approximately one hundred medical-sanitation stations have already been opened. The people's authority devotes special attention to preserving the cultural centers and monuments of antiquity, temples, pagodas, etc. After the liberation of the country, the freedom of religion was restored and the Buddhist clergy who have remained alive are making their contribution to the resolution of the problems that are confronting the country.

Possibly these results might seem modest to some people, but it is necessary to start counting from that fatal landmark at which nonexistence begins and where the criminal Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique almost brought the Kampuchean nation by attempting to carry out the expansionist program of their Beijing bosses.

On the international scene the People's Republic of Kampuchea conducts a course of reinforcing the combat solidarity with the fraternal nations of Indochina, the establishment and development of friendly ties with the countries of the socialist community, decisively supports the national-liberation struggle of nations, conducts a policy of nonalignment, and speaks out against imperialism, colonialism and neocolonialism, international reaction, racism, and Zionism. The revolutionary government is in favor of establishing goodneighborly relations with the countries of Southeast Asia, primarily with Thailand, and strives to convert the Kampuchean-Thai border into a line of peace and security on the basis of principles of coexistence. The NRK has declared its readiness to construct its relations on these principles with out SEA countries also, and to promote the conversion of the region into a zone of peace, stability, and prosperity.

The young state is forming especially close relations with Vietnam and Laos. On the basis of the Vietnamese-Kampuchean treaty of peace, friendship, and cooperation, the SRV renders to Kampuchea a large amount of assistance in restoring the destroyed economy, restoring the normal life of the population, and defending the gains of the revolution against the intrigues of enemy forces. The country has military subdivisions from Vietnam which, as the representatives of the SRV and NRK have declared, will be removed after the elimination of the threat of foreign interference into its internal affairs. Various kinds of assistance are being provided to Kampuchea by the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. The international authority of the NRK is increasing; at the present time it is recognized by 30 states.

Having suffered defeat in Kampuchea, the Chinese leadership has, however, not renounced its intention to establish control over that country and to use it in its political plans in Southeast Asia. Beijing continues to deliver weapons and ammunition to the remnants of the Pol Pot gangs that have dug in well in Thailand, encouraging them to carry out subversive actions and terroristic acts on the territory of the NRK with the purpose of inhibiting the process of returning the country to normal life.

Recently Beijing has adopted the slogan of the so-called "political settlement" in Kampuchea, a slogan that has been disseminated for a long

time by Western propaganda. This attests to the fact that the Chinese strategists have ceased counting only upon the bankrupt clique. One's attention is drawn by another factor: the Pol Pot regime was given the assignment of chasing into Thailand as large a number of Kampuchians as possible, first of all, for the purpose of supplementing their combat detachments, and, secondly, for the purpose of confirming the thesis that "two zones," "two administrations" exist in Kampuchea.

By extending the noisy propaganda campaign concerning the question of "urgent humanitarian aid" to the population of the country, the West and Beijing are striving to use the United Nations and other international organizations for the purpose of interfering in the internal affairs of the NRK, and to legalize the rendering of assistance to the Pol Pot gangs that have not yet been beaten. Thus, at the most recent session of the United Nations General Assembly, the imperialistic power managed to push through a resolution of Kampuchea which the NRK completely justifiably evaluated as being illegal and completely devoid of legal force, since it was adopted without the participation of, and contrary to the will of, the legal government of the country and represents an act of interference in its internal affairs.

In the final analysis all these intrigues are doomed to failure. The Kampuchean problem has been resolved by the people of that country themselves, and has been resolved finally. As it overcomes the numerous difficulties that were inherited from the imperialistic aggression and the Maoist experiments, the People's Republic of Kampuchea has entered the second year of its existence surrounded by faithful and reliable friends, with a firm confidence in the triumph of its just struggle for freedom, independence, and a bright future.

FOOTNOTES

1. Quoted from *PROBLEMY DAL'NEGO VOSTOKA*, No 4, 1973, p 29.
2. *Pravda o v'yetsnamo-kitayskikh otnosheniyakh za posledniye 30 let* [The Truth Concerning Vietnamese-Chinese Relations During the Past 30 Years], publication of the SRV Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 1979, p 13.
3. *Ibid.*, p 62.
4. *Dossier Kampuchie*, I, Hanoi, 1978, p 8.
5. "Materials of the Revolutionary People's Tribunal Which Met in Phnom Penh in August 1979 to Judge the Case Against the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary Clique, Accused of the Crime of Genocide," documents No 2.6.04^b and 2.6.04^d.
6. From an interview given by Ieng Sary to James Pringle on 4 September 1975, published in the bulletin of the Royal Government of the National

Unity of Kampuchea, No 220, bis/75.

7. See: F. Ponchaud, *Cambodge année zéro* [Cambodia Year Zero]) Paris, 1977, p 72.
8. *Ibid.*, p 36.
9. *Ibid.*, p 84.
10. *Ibid.*, p 94.
11. Quoted from *Kampuchiya: ot tragedii k vosrozhdeniyu* [Kampuchea: From Tragedy to Rebirth], Moscow, 1979, p 83.
12. See: *Ibid.*, p 52.
13. *Pravda o v'yetnamo-kitayskikh otnosheniyakh za posledniye 30 let*, p 55.
14. From documents promulgated during the trial of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique in August 1979. Documents No 2.5.25 and 2.5.25b.
15. *K istorii v'yetnamsko-kampuchiyskogo konflikta* [On the History of the Vietnamese-Kampuchean Conflict], Hanoi, 1979, p 23.
16. *Pravda o v'yetnamo-kitayskikh otnosheniyakh za posledniye 30 let*, pp 89-90.
17. Document No 2.5.28 of the materials pertaining to the trial of the Pol Pot-Ieng Sary clique.
18. FAR EASTERN ECONOMIC REVIEW, 26 January 1979, p 13.

COPYRIGHT: Izdatel'stvo "Pravda", "Mirovaya ekonomika i mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya", 1980.

5075

CSO: 1800

INTERNATIONAL

WEST STALLS VIENNA TALKS TO STEP UP MILITARY PREPARATIONS

Moscow NOVOSTI DAILY NEWS in English 30 Apr 80 pp 1-5

[Interview with Vasily Morozov, Novosti Press Agency (APN) military analyst, by Lt Gen Nikolai Chervov, USSR military expert, date and place not given]

[Text] Lieutenant-General Nikolai Chervov, a Soviet military expert, analyses in an interview with Vasily Morozov, a Novosti Press Agency (APN) Military Analyst, the results and prospects of the Vienna talks on mutual force and arms reductions in Central Europe.

Q.: General, could you kindly comment on what remains today the major difficulties at the Vienna talks?

A.: The talks on mutual force and arms reductions in Central Europe have been under way in Vienna for more than six years now. The 20th round has been completed, without producing any positive results. The Western parties to the talks are now departing even from those agreed positions which the sides reached earlier. As far as the socialist countries are concerned, they have exerted much effort in the past years towards making progress at the talks and, displaying important initiatives, have striven to put them on a practical plane. The basic meaning of all proposals of the Warsaw Treaty countries is that they fully accord with the principle of equality and equal security and provide for such a reduction that does not lead to a change in the balance of forces in Central Europe in favour of some or other parties to the talks. In other words, the socialist state stand for preserving military parity that has taken shape in Central Europe, but at lower levels of forces and armaments. The NATO countries do not respond with constructive proposals to the initiatives of the Warsaw Treaty states and it is through their fault that the Vienna negotiations, so vitally important for the peoples of Europe, are, in fact, at a deadlock.

Naturally, the question arises: what are the actual reasons for the failure to reach a mutually acceptable understanding after the many years of intensive discussions in Vienna and why have the parties to the talks so far proved unable to go over to the practical working out of an agreement on mutual force and arms reductions in Central Europe? An answer to the

question has been supplied by Leonid Brezhnev. "For only one reason: the NATO countries," he said, "refuse to give up trying to use the negotiations to secure unilateral military advantages. For some reason, the West wants, even demands, concessions prejudicial to the security of the socialist countries. Yet we have not noticed any inclination on the part of the NATO bloc to make similar concessions to the other side." Such a stand, of course, cannot contribute to progress at the talks, however hard the socialist states may try to get things going there.

The Vienna negotiations are alleged to have come to a standstill owing to differences in assessing the numerical strength of the sides. Despite the official exchange of information, the West asserts, without furnishing any proofs, that the Warsaw Treaty countries have in the reductions area many more troops than it has been announced at the talks. Therefore, the West alleges, they should reduce 3.5 times as many troops as NATO.

The West's figures on the numerical strength are far-fetched. It has been told so more than once at the highest level. And, indeed, many Western leaders themselves admit that there exists approximate military parity in Central Europe. Moreover, they admit it in public. However, at the talks in Vienna the NATO countries continue reiterating their old view, questioning the information submitted by the socialist countries on the numerical strength of their troops, without giving any proofs on this score. What really matters, however, are, of course, not figures. Frankly speaking, this is just a tactic on the part of Western countries, an attempt to evade solving the question of mutual reductions.

The West's unwillingness to agree to lowering the level of military confrontation in Central Europe and to lessening tension in the region is clearly confirmed by the latest (of December 20, 1979) "simplified" proposals of the NATO countries, which they advocated during the 20th round of negotiations. The essence of these proposals is that the USSR should reduce its land forces by 30,000 troops, doing so by whole divisions, while the USA by 13,000 troops, of which two-thirds by units of sizes unknown to us and the remaining one-third by individual servicemen in general. After carrying out the reductions, ceilings should be fixed on what will remain of the numerical strength of the Soviet and US land forces. As a result of a thorough analysis of the West's latest proposals, delegations of the socialist countries subjected them to criticism point by point. They have shown that the Western proposals far from making any headway at the talks, are a substantial retreat compared to the position the NATO countries held prior to submitting them. Though it may appear strange, things stand precisely that way.

Formerly, the West European parties to the talks, influenced by the well-grounded arguments of the socialist countries, expressed a readiness to commit themselves to reduce at a second stage the numerical strength of their troops, whereas today they have abandoned this stand of theirs. They would like to see only the land forces of the USSR and the USA reduced, while completely

keeping out of reductions the forces of Federal Germany, Britain and other West European countries and Canada, which account for 75 per cent of the numerical strength of NATO forces in Central Europe. The West European states now do not want to assume commitments to reduce their troops; moreover, they even refuse at least to "freeze" their numerical strength.

Let us take, for instance, West Germany's stand at the talks. If one takes aside the propaganda camouflage, West Germany is in fact seeking for a maximum reduction of Soviet troops and for an insignificant reduction of the US forces. Does this show the desire to solve the problem on mutually acceptable terms or to get unilateral advantages? Of course, the latter. West Germany itself has no intentions to reduce its armed forces and armaments. It is not going to take pledges to limit the numerical strength of the Bundeswehr at least by its present level. A similar stand is taken by Britain and other West European NATO countries. Such a refusal of the West to freeze and then to cut its troops looks especially unseemly against the background of the clearly expressed readiness of socialist states (the German Democratic Republic, Poland and Czechoslovakia) to take unambiguous pledges on this score on a reciprocal basis.

It is worth noting that the United States is only creating the semblance that it is striving to reach an accord. Actually it does not display any real interest in reducing its military potential in Europe. On the US initiative and with the support of West Germany, the West's new proposals have fully removed from the agenda the agreed-upon subject of the talks--the reduction of armaments. While earlier the United States suggested that in exchange for the reduction of Soviet tanks a certain amount of US nuclear ammunition and means of its delivery should be reduced, now, after the recent decision by NATO on the deployment of new American medium-range missiles in Western Europe, it has repudiated this proposal.

According to the assessment made by the delegations of socialist countries, Western proposals impose on us unequal terms of reducing the land forces of the Soviet Union and the United States. They do not take into account the unilateral reduction of troops and armaments by the Soviet Union (it involves the reduction of troops by 20,000 servicemen, of tanks by 1,000 vehicles and of a large number of other military equipment). At the same time, Western representatives are trying to pass over in silence the large buildup of US troops in Central Europe. As it has been admitted for instance, by US Defence Secretary Harold Brown, the numerical strength of the American troops stationed in West Germany alone has been increased of late by 26,000 servicemen. Suggesting now the reduction of the Soviet land forces by 30,000 men, the West would like us to cut the troops actually by 50,000 men. As far as the United States is concerned, the withdrawal of 13,000 men will not actually compensate for the increase already effected in this region by the USA during the talks. The delegates of socialist countries have convincingly explained to their Western counterparts that the West's position does not correspond to the principle of the reciprocity and equivalence of the commitments.

Western countries continue to make their proposals dependent on the attainment of agreement on the numerical strength of the Soviet and US land troops and also on the adoption by socialist countries of such a system of attendant measures which puts under control the whole organisational setup and everyday activity of the Warsaw Treaty troops. The experience has shown, however, that the so-called "discussion on figures" is deliberately used by the West just to drag out the talks, and as far as numerous measures of control are concerned, they mostly are totally unconnected with troop reductions. These measures demonstrate nothing else but the desire of the NATO bloc to get unhindered access to data on the troops of socialist countries far beyond the region of the reduction, mainly in a considerable part of the European section of the Soviet Union. As you see, in this issue and on some other points the West's proposals do not contribute to the progress at the talks.

Western propaganda tries to convince the public that the West's "simplified" proposals are "very significant and essential." However, such attempts are futile. The delegations of socialist countries have shown quite persuasively that the West's proposals do not offer any compromise which would meet halfway socialist countries in order to bring the positions of the sides closer to each other. In fact, these proposals make null and void the fruits of the joint work of about seven years' standing and are definitely aimed at protracting the negotiations.

The West's negative stand along all the lines of the Vienna talks is closely linked with the general course of NATO, and primarily the United States, geared at stepping up military preparations. When at the end of 1979 NATO leaders decided on the production and deployment of new hundreds of American medium-range missiles in some West European countries, primarily West Germany, they deliberately caused the serious exacerbation of the situation in Europe and imposed additional difficulties on the Vienna talks.

Q.: What conclusion can be drawn? What is demanded of the participants in the Vienna talks to lead them out of the impasse?

A.: Only one conclusion can be made: the Vienna talks can be led out of the blind-alley if the Western side does not seek for unilateral military advantages. As it has been pointed out by Leonid Brezhnev in his interview with a Pravda correspondent, "we are for talks, but for honest and equal talks, for the observance of the principle of equal security."

A mutually acceptable agreement is quite feasible if, of course, Western participants show a desire to reach it. There is an objective foundation for such an accord. The well-known compromise proposals by socialist countries of June 8 and November 30, 1978 and of June 28, 1979 have long been submitted to the negotiating table. They have taken into consideration a number of important proposals by the West and have reflected the care for the preservation of the military equilibrium in Europe. They are aimed at cutting not only land troops, but also the air force and armaments, i.e. they call for a serious and real reduction of the military potentials of the sides and for a lessening of the possibility of military conflicts.

The constructive proposals of socialist states are buttressed by practical deeds. The Soviet Union has initiated the real movement in this direction by the unilateral withdrawal of a large group of its troops and armaments from the German Democratic Republic. Despite the West's attempt to aggravate the international situation, this reduction is systematically being carried out. It should be noted that not auxiliary units and not individual servicemen, but combat formations and units are being withdrawn from the German Democratic Republic. Doesn't this show who stands for the scaling down of the military confrontation in Europe and who stands for its increase. It is high time for NATO countries to respond to the constructive and workable steps of socialist countries not by empty words, but by a concrete contribution to the lessening of the military confrontation and to disarmament, as it is envisaged by the Final Act of the Helsinki Conference on European Security and Cooperation, which has been signed by the states participating in the Vienna talks.

CSO: 1812

INTERNATIONAL

ERNST GENRI ON GROWTH OF NEOFASCISM IN WEST AND ASIA

Moscow NOVYY MIR in Russian No 1, 1980 pp 180-190

[Article by Ernst Genri: "Neofascism Raises its Head"]

[Text] The 35th anniversary of the victory of the greatest battle in man's history--the victory over fascism--is drawing near. In whom of us are those years not indelibly printed on our hearts for the rest of our lives?

There are global political epidemics which are incomparably more terrible than physical epidemics. The world experienced one of these in the 1930's and 1940's, and had it not been for the socialist great power, which won the main battle against the Hitlerite plague, the world might have perished. The Earth could possibly have been turned for centuries to come into a planet of monsters and sadists. People of the older generation will never forget that experience.

The question arises, and it is now being put increasingly often: could such a thing be in store again? Will fascism live on in the remaining decades of our century? Will it succeed in switching to an attack in earnest, to revenge for 1945, or will we observe merely its delayed death pangs? Are there more or less noticeable new Hitler and Mussolini candidates acting on the stage or is it merely a question of adventurists and small-time scoundrels?

It is clear that much depends for the future, particularly of Europeans, on the answer to these questions.

This subject has been a matter of dispute every year since the war. Opinions have been divided. Many people believed that as a result of the war fascism had been, if not killed off outright, then, at all events, crippled to such an extent that it is capable in the big international arena in our time only of toddling and sputtering, but not of attacking in earnest. It has been pointed out, for example, that in the contemporary capitalist world there is no country, other than Italy, with a mass fascist party;

and that even the fascism in the Pyrenean peninsula, in Spain and Portugal, which ruled even after the war, ignominiously collapsed in the 1970's. It has been emphasized that the petite bourgeoisie, which previously poured into fascist organizations in droves, is now in many cases sooner moving to the left than to the right or remaining apathetic. Finally, attention has been drawn to the fact that monopoly capital, which is also allegedly taking account of the past, is now more inclined to support "peaceful," respectable parties than fascist cutthroats.

All this undoubtedly corresponds to reality to some extent. Nevertheless, we are today confronted with the fact that, after having been in a relatively long faint, fascism is beginning to come to and stand on its feet. There is even reason to believe that it is again preparing to hurl itself on mankind--if not tomorrow, then during the lifetime of the generations thriving today.

Is this the case?

We look around the West.

Signals attesting an activization of the neofascists are coming in simultaneously from various countries.

A shadow emerging from Hitler's grave has suddenly appeared on the horizon in West Germany--the one-time center of world fascism. Books about him are selling in vast numbers, and films "humanizing" him are being viewed by millions of people. Phonograph records of his speeches and diaries of Speer, organizer of the Nazi war industry, and the speeches of Goebbels are enjoying extensive distribution, articles are published on the Gestapo leader Heydrich, and there are even facsimile reprints of Hitler's newspaper VOELKISCHER BEOBACHTER. Nor is television lagging behind here.

It is perfectly obvious that none of this is fortuitous or spontaneous. Somebody is conducting the orchestra backstage. There is no big neo-Nazi party (the main fascist organization--the NPD--had 9,000 members in 1977), but neo-Nazi propaganda is suddenly assuming mass proportions. It might have seemed that the one does not tally with the other. But this is not so. It turns out--and this does not only apply to West Germany--that aggressive fascism is conceivable even without big organizations operating in the open.

Not only that. Flagrant fascist excesses are on the increase in the FRG, also allegedly "spontaneously." In 1977 even the authorities noted almost a doubling of such provocations, with the neo-Nazi bands' "increased readiness" to use violence. It has been established that these bands are systematically accumulating weapons, ammunition and explosives, even raiding army depots for this purpose. This is new.

There is a rekindling of anti-Semitism, although only 24,000 Jews remain in West Germany. There has been a resumption of instances of desecration of Jewish cemeteries. There were explosions during the transmission of a documentary film of Hitler's plan for the universal extermination of the Jews. "After the explosions," the social democratic newspaper NEUE RUHR-ZEITUNG wrote at that time on this subject, "no one can any longer portray old and new Nazis as some kind of curiosity and as barely visible trouble-makers who are irritating, but who are tolerated in a society which prides itself on its variety of opinions." Absolutely right. It is now quite difficult to deny the presence of a real fascist threat across the Elbe. As we will note below, there are also other, particular, facts confirming that this is the case.

But the spread of relapses into fascism is not confined to West Germany, and this is very typical. As will become apparent, there are no "national" specifics here. Approximately the same thing may be observed in other West European countries, albeit not quite so distinctively everywhere. The Nazis are, after all, old specialists at their job.

In Italy, where the neofascist Italian Social Movement (MSI) has a membership of approximately 300,000, fascist banditry has become something of a daily occurrence. In January of last year communist senators declared that the neofascists were attempting to create an "atmosphere of chaos" in Rome. Squads of specially trained thugs are continuously attempting to inspire fear in the public.

A thousand kilometers to the north, in Britain, a country where fascism was unable to take root before the war, there has been a sharp change—again more or less suddenly—in the situation. Growing out of the small National Socialist Movement, the racist National Front is breaking out onto the streets of British cities, although it cannot make its way into the House of Commons. Frenzied agitation is conducted against the colored population for the votes of unemployed whites. But the typically Hitlerite face of this band has already been revealed. Its ringleader, J. Tyndall, does not conceal the fact that he follows the teaching of the Fuehrer. "Britain," the London SUNDAY MIRROR writes, "is faced with a growing threat from a new generation of Nazis. The National Front plans to come to power by the same path as taken by Hitler in Germany in the 1930's." "The National Front," prominent Labor Party figure J. Jones confirms, "is the modern British firm of fascism." And yet on so many occasions in the past and even relatively recently almost all British Labor and Conservative politicians assured us with a self-confident smile that nothing as scandalous as fascism could grow in British soil, in good old Britain, and that this could be ruled out. History is indeed a teacher, albeit not right away, of many people, but far from all. But then the times are a relatively harsh teacher.

In France the neofascists are not yet crawling out of their lairs quite so openly, although their cells are scattered throughout the country. As before, they are waiting for the day when the left forces in France win a

majority at the general election and find themselves at the gates of power. In any event, people are being trained in the practice of terrorism here also. It should not be forgotten what happened in France about 15 years ago, when the secret fascist OAS had the whole country under fire. OAS regulars have not disappeared from French cities and have not fallen asleep on the stove. Having gone into hiding, they are biding their time, in order to embark on terrorism once again on some new pretext. Who is behind them this time?

Even the so recently smashed Spanish, Portuguese and Greek fascists, whom many thought would no longer be able to muster their forces, have begun to stir. A conspiracy of Francoists who planned to seize the government building, arrest ministers and create a "government of national salvation" was discovered in Spain. Even earlier five neo-Francoist parties had united in the legal Popular Alliance, which is represented in parliament.

Counting on exacerbating the economic crisis and the split in the democratic camp, the fascists in Portugal have been mustering their forces again virtually undisguisedly. The fascist Organization of National Revival, which had set off 70 explosions in Athens in 2 years and which aspires to restore the "black colonels" regime, was discovered in Greece last year.

We could extend this list, including other pages from the "Neofascism in Europe" dossier here. But is it worth it? The trend is perfectly clear.

There is no need to lay it on especially thick. We cannot yet speak of an actual, general mobilization of fascist forces. Something very like preparation for it and preliminary training to check out combat readiness is underway, however. One wonders: why have the neofascists begun to stir precisely now, at the end of the 1970's? What is motivating them? There are two answers. One complements the other.

The crisis of Western capitalist society is being exacerbated now in the eyes of all, even those ordinary people, not overly interested in politics. There has not been such a crisis for many years. The class struggle both within individual capitalist countries and in the international arena is intensifying. A number of states is turning onto the path leading toward socialism. In other countries, Italy, for example, the forces of the ruling bourgeois parties are weakening.

There is nothing surprising in the fact that at this moment the attention of the strategists of the capitalist world is again--for the first time since the war--turning in a perfectly definite direction. It is not yet time, evidently, to expect any sudden dramatic steps from this direction, but a sudden surprise here or there can no longer be ruled out.

Influential rightwing forces in the West have until this point held the neofascists in reserve, keeping them for an emergency, as it were. This has led to the neofascist organizations, not receiving sufficiently

palpable stimuli from outside, being at a comparative standstill, for the most part. They have made a noise where and how they have been able and begun practice in terrorism, but they have not yet ventured upon wide-ranging political actions. Fascism has not quit the scene, but neither has it really moved forward.

Another thing has contributed to this. Virtually nowhere did the masses head for fascism after the war. The memory of what they had lived through was alive in people, and nobody, apart from a handful of professional cut-throats and psychopaths, wished to repeat the past. Neither in the center of West Europe, nor in the Pyrenees nor in the United States were large neofascist organizations capable of playing for high stakes successfully created. The successors of Hitler and Mussolini were running on the spot, although they were leaning over backward to move forward.

There is now much that is different. The neofascists believe that in the 1980's they will be able to muster a multitude of new supporters. And this is particularly important for them now. For it is clear: Whatever plans they may be hatching to make their way to power, they will not succeed at the decisive moment without considerable support. What is replacing the mass fascist parties which have disappeared?

It is sufficient to take a look at the activity of the contemporary neofascist organizations in different countries to observe primarily whom they are trying to recruit. It is the young people. An unflagging race for the youth and the advanced part of the student body, the younger generation in the capitalist countries knows almost nothing about the past, as a rule--neither about World War II nor about fascism. The bourgeois school and the bourgeois state do not usually lift a finger to help the young people learn and understand what took place then. This is a phenomenon which is striking and tragic in its consequences, but it is a fact.

Deceiving those who do not know is quite easy. It is a question not only of high school children but also of a considerable proportion of the bourgeois student body. The type of young person currently growing up in West Germany, for example, is shown by the following facts (from the data of Soviet research assistant L. G. Istyagin). It became clear from surveys carried out by liberal and social democratic circles in the FRG that a considerable proportion of the schoolchildren in this country is guided by "anticommunist views, negative cliches and fantastic ideas about the threat of the communists." Over 40 percent of the senior grade schoolchildren questioned declared that they had nothing against "national socialists occupying leading positions" in the country, and 60 percent expressed themselves in favor of a "strong national party," that is, the same Nazis.

In Bavaria 48 percent of young people responded that they would welcome the appearance of a dictator if he proved "a capable statesmen." In West Germany as a whole this idea was shared by 30 percent of the young people questioned.

The FRG's ruling circles are well aware of this and are nervous about it. "I observe with growing unease," A. Humber, Bonn's minister of youth, family and health, declared not so long ago, "how some young people are displaying an ever increasing interest in rightwing ideology, the personality of the 'Fuehrer', the 'romance of the Wehrmacht'...." The neo-Nazis are hammering in the stake here also. In other words, the prerequisites are emerging for the birth of a new Hitlerjugend.

It has been observed that whereas at the end of the 1960's the nucleus of the neofascist NPD consisted predominately of old Nazis and SS members, now it consists chiefly of young people who joined the organization during the 1974-1975 economic crisis and most recently. While the number of members of the NPD itself has fallen, its Young National Democrats youth organization has even expanded.

It should be taken into consideration that over two dozen other neofascist organizations which are also recruiting supporters predominantly among the youth are currently operating in West Germany together with the NPD. These are the Young Vikings, the Stahlhelm Youth, the National Socialist Action Front, Racial German Youth and others. What are they up to? This is no secret: primarily regular combat training. Military exercises are held, explosives equipment and the practice of street provocations are studied, and weapons are stolen from depots. The same organizations are drawing up blacklists of people against whom reprisals will be taken in due course. Thus, for example, Kuehnen, leader of the National Socialist Action Front terrorist youth band, has declared: "We have lists with the name of many judges, police officials, lawyers and communists--in readiness for Day X." Liberal judges and police officials are intimidated the same as communists. A new generation of SS men is being trained in this way.

Similar phenomena can be observed in a number of other Western countries. In Italy, where young people constitute the majority of the army of unemployed, the neofascist party has done and is doing everything to win them over to its side.

Today's youth is tomorrow's real political figure. The neofascists are also building their calculations on this. Of course, only the most backward and most immature strata of the youth fall into their net. The best young people become active antifascists. But it is precisely the immature people whom the neofascists need. The business is not confined to young people, however.

Another thing has become clear recently. Wherever they can, the neofascists are trying to draw yet another stratum (if it can be called a stratum) closer to them--the Lumpenproletariat. There is nothing really new in this move on their part. The Lumpenproletariat, particularly its criminal and quasi-criminal elements, was also recruited by the fascists in the past. In Germany from the very beginning Hitler's stormtrooper and SS detachments

included a considerable number of criminals, who, together with retired officers, taught the Nazis how to organize pogroms and how to plunder and kill.

Hitler himself was a typical Lumpenproletarian at the start of his career. Horst Wessel, the leader of the Berlin Nazis in the 1920's, came from the same milieu. Mussolini's guard swarmed with the same riff-raff. Fascists and criminals have always been linked not only by something common in their bandit mentality but also by a mutual frenzied hatred of the workers movement, the intelligentsia and genuine culture.

Now, however, the Lumpenproletariat as a social stratum living in the basement of bourgeois society has grown considerably. Under the impact of that same economic crisis which is throwing millions of people in the capitalist countries overboard the Lumpenproletariat is forming an entire army. There is a particular increase in the number of those same criminals. There are reports of this from various countries.

Sociologists and legal experts have already written a good deal about the relatively unprecedented growth of crime in contemporary capitalist society. But it is essential to take into consideration the political consequences of this process also. It is precisely neofascism here which gains most from the growth of crime. The fascistization of the society-hating Lumpenproletariat is proceeding relatively rapidly, and, reinforcing their ranks, the neofascists are opening wide the door to it. The influx of the Lumpenproletariat into their organizations is not being advertised, of course. But it is indeed being welcomed there with open arms, such thugs being incorporated as "specialists" primarily in the terrorist bands. Some of them even become leading figures in the organization. Thus in the West German city of Duisburg the NPD not so long ago put forward two ex-criminals as its candidates for local authority positions. A leader of the same party in Braunschweig had attempted to rob a bank in the past. Similar incidents have been observed in Italy, Portugal and Japan, where the Lumpenproletariat receives payment by the hour for participating in fascist street provocations.

The National Socialist Liberation Front operating in the United States, which is drawing up blacklists of those whom they have sentenced to death and which has already organized assassination attempts with bombs, consists predominantly of convicted criminals. It is the easiest thing of all to transform professional gangsters into fascists.

The fascists are also attempting to recruit those people who have slid down into the Lumpenproletariat who are not yet involved in the criminal world but who as a result of chronic unemployment have lost all hope for a normal existence. They are promised not only decent pay for their services but also a career in the future.

It is evidently impossible to overlook the possibility of a further influx of the Lumpenproletariat into the neofascists, particularly in the event of an exacerbation of the crisis in the West. These people are also willing personnel for the formation of terrorist bands. For the present-day fascists they are to a certain extent replacing the petit bourgeois sonny boys of Hitler's times.

But all this still fails to provide an answer to the question of how the neofascists are counting on coming to power in this country or the other. It is clear that they cannot accomplish this by themselves. The correlation of forces in the world is entirely different from before the war. Antifascism is incomparably stronger than then, and the neofascists know this. Counting in our day on a repetition of the tragic split in the antifascist forces is hardly possible. The workers movement has not forgotten the bitter past. It stands to reason that the fascists have no wish to risk a head-on clash with this movement, at least in Europe. In other words, in order to approach power they now need sufficiently powerful allies in the upper crust of the bourgeois state.

Such allies exist.

These are, first, the rightwing and extreme right parties which have authority in a given country. Second--and here lies the conspirators' main hope--the profascist generals who aspire to become dictators--generals of the Pinochet type. They are not hard to find. Such generals and admirals are currently to be found all over in the West and are only waiting their hours; they are waiting under the mask of loyal guards of the bourgeois-democratic system or without a mask as open supporters of dictatorship. They all fear a halt to the arms race and peaceful coexistence like fire. They all stand for extreme anticommunism and for the preparation of terror in collusion with the American and NATO "hawks." They are all utterly confident that it is precisely they who have been ordained to "save the country" from communism and the "Soviet threat." And threads stretch from all of them to the military departments of the imperialist powers, particularly to the headquarters of the paratroops and marines and to intelligence. To become new Pinochets or new "black colonels"--they live for this. In practice the generals of the ultraright, having become dictators, will inevitably hand over actual power to the fascist regulars. Foreseeing this, the latter are ready to offer the rightwing military at any moment their services as a Praetorian Guard. That is why the neofascists are now supporting everywhere the idea of military dictatorship and reactionary generals. Thus, for example, Hoffmann, leader of the terrorist Military Sport neofascist band in Nuremberg, openly declares the aim behind his organization conducting regular military exercises: to prepare, he said, "for Day X, when the police will no longer be able to cope with the left by themselves."

Hoffmann is echoed overseas by Kale, Fuehrer of the American National Socialist Party, who declared: "When total catastrophe strikes, that will be our golden hour. The ruling elite will no longer be able to control the panic-stricken common people. And then we will propose our ideas and our

leadership.... Enemies will be shown no mercy!" This is a signal to the military: Carry out a coup d'etat, we are right behind you!

Nor is it fortuitous that in West Germany the neo-Nazis are now vigorously trying to put down roots in the Bundeswehr. It was estimated back in the 1960's that approximately one out of every four Bundeswehr soldiers or officers sympathized with the neo-Nazi. Instances have been observed in recent years of employees or retired military personnel participating in the organization of fascist mob gathering and perpetrating acts of terrorism. Almost all the Bundeswehr's training centers have turned out to be mixed up in such matters.

The same phenomena are to be observed in Italy. For years now influential generals and admirals dreaming of carrying out a coup d'etat and installing a military dictatorship in Rome have been openly or covertly operating in the milieu of the local fascists. Despite the scandalous exposures, some of them still occupy high positions.

The same information is coming out of Portugal and Spain, where Francoist generals are incessantly weaving the threads of conspiracies. The Falangists demonstrating in the streets of Spain's cities yell: "The army to power!" NATO Headquarters is concealed behind all these forces.

With one exception, there are as yet no big neofascist parties in Europe. But military fascism could substitute for them fully at a critical moment. The Pinochets are now more dangerous than the little Hitlers. Extreme-right circles are thinking only of how to help them come to power as quickly as possible.

It is worth noting in this connection something else that is new in the operations of contemporary fascists: their disguise as terrorists of a leftist persuasion. Not all observers in the West are paying sufficient heed to the significance of this gambit.

A whole number of factors confirms that the fascists are not conducting this operation randomly but in planned manner. The purpose is clear: to intensify with the aid of mass pseudoleft terrorism an atmosphere of tension in this country or the other, particularly in Italy, and thus clear the path for the dictatorship of the profascist generals. To judge by everything, the decision to embark on such a policy was adopted by the neofascist leaders back at the end of the 1960's and was approved at secret international meetings of neofascist leaders in Cattolica (on the shore of the Adriatic) in March 1974 and in Lyon in December of the same year. It is worth dwelling on this.

A strictly secret organization pretending to the role of a kind of "black international" is currently operating in West Europe. The most active neofascist groups in various countries which stand for pure-blooded, 100-percent Hitlerism, including the cult of the Fuehrer and Il Duce, racism

and anti-Semitism, belong to it. More aggressive fascists do not exist. The majority of the branches of this organization has taken the name New Order or Black Order. Its founders in January 1953 were regular SS officers from Himmler's foreign legions who had returned unpunished after the war to their own countries and had resolved to continue their bloody career at home. About 10 years later they were joined by a number of bankrupt leaders of the biggest fascist terrorist organization in France--the OAS (Secret Army Organization)--which had for years been horrifying the country with murders and explosions, but which at the start of the 1960's had lost the majority of its members.

It is significant that in a number of instances the leading SS and OAS men in the New Order organization were one and the same persons; the Frenchmen who had joined it from the OAS had, for the most part, served Hitler during the war. The most rabid Italian neofascists from the MSI, who are close to the ultrareactionary military, became a third prop of this terrorist international.

According to material of the rightwing Italian newspaper IL TEMPO, which is well informed in such matters, the following subject was on the agenda of the "black international" meeting in Cattolica on 1 March 1974: "Terrorizing the antifascists with bombs; inspiring horror with mass murders; and creating tension with acts of violence, employing the methods of the great and unforgettable OAS."

It is also known who is at the head of the "black international".... First, Ralph (Geren-Serak), former French officer of the Charlemagne SS detachment and a former OAS captain. Second, Deputy Pino Rauti, a leader of the extreme wing of Italy's neofascists. Until recently Leon (Degrell'), a former Belgian officer of the SS Wallonia Division and also an accomplice in the OAS, was part of the New Order leadership. This person, who has been sentenced to death in his own country, has been living in Spain, where he collaborated with Hitler's favorite Otto Skorzeny, the last leader of Nazi intelligence. All these persons are fanatical supporters of fascist terrorism. The plan for introducing neofascists to leftist organizations was also formulated under their leadership, evidently. This plan's existence is not in doubt. In 1978 the Italian senator A. Banfi, president of the International Federation of Resistance Fighters, made public the following fact. Subsequently exposed "Aginter" underground agents, who were connected with the "black international," had drawn up a draft which said:

"We believe that destruction of the state structure (of a liberal-bourgeois country--E.G.) should be the priority and that this should be effected under the cover of actions by left extremists and pro-Chinese forces. We have already introduced (our own--E.G.) elements in all these groups and we must clearly adapt our own actions--propaganda and acts of violence--to them such as to give the appearance that they emanate from our communist adversaries."

Senator Banfi knew what he was talking about: He has assembled information from the most varied sources and the most varied countries. It is apparent from this same material that even then the fascists in Italy, for example, had in fact succeeded in infiltrating their agents into the Metropolitan Political Collective—an organization which was the forerunner of the present Red Brigades.

More. It subsequently became clear that the head of these "brigades" was none other than Renato Curcio—a former participant in the Italian branch of the same New Order! Curcio is currently in prison for participating in acts of terrorism. The murder of former Italian Premier Moro in 1979, which outraged the whole country, was committed by members of this organization.

There are also other confirmations of this "integration" of right and left extremists. It has been established that the group of leftist terrorists in southern Italy called Armed Proletarian Nuclei is almost identical with the neofascist Mussolini Action Group. In Turkey it is difficult to distinguish fascists in general from leftists, and, in Spain, from the GRAPO Maoist terrorist organization.

A Maoist organization calling itself Communist Party of Switzerland Marxists-Leninists was founded in September 1967 in Switzerland. Former SS and OAS officer Ralph (Geren-Serak), the leader of the "black international" himself, and Leroy, another former SS and OAS man, were among its leading members. It sounds improbably, but it is a fact. "Former" fascist Mario Merlino, an assistant of these persons, became on their instructions a founder of the leftist Italian terrorist group "22 March." On an assignment from Rauti, leader of the fascist Black Order, this Merlino specially penetrated leftist organizations and organized bomb explosions with their assistance. And so forth.

The facts are indisputable. It is important to take account of the fact that all these contacts and connections are not made by the neofascists at random and sporadically but manifestly in organized fashion, methodically. A definite plan is being implemented. The New Order organization which is implementing it may now undoubtedly be considered the main operations center or international fascism with branches or agents in almost all West European countries. The directives adopted at international conferences of this center are implemented by dozens of organizations locally. At present this is happening primarily in the Romance countries. Left extremism is imbued, as it were, with neofascism. The threads also extend to the CIA.

It cannot be denied that many sincere rank and file leftists fall easily into the neofascists' net. Their extreme political naivete, which becomes criminal irresponsibility, the lack of genuine revolutionary experience, the atmosphere of perpetual despair which reigns in their circles and, finally, an inclination on the part of this person or the other toward adventurism are to blame for this. The pollution of the ranks of the leftist

organizations by Lumpenproletarian elements ready, as always, to sell out both themselves and their organization is also contributing to this. It is this on which the neofascists are making their play, constantly urging the left extremists on to acts of anarchy. Everything indicates that they will continue to pursue the policy of taking cover behind "leftwing" masks and even step it up. This is a very inexpensive game for the neofascists, but the winnings could be considerable.

It is essentially a question of a repetition in an expanded, new form of the old Hitlerite maneuver of the burning of the Reichstag, which was organized by the Nazis themselves and ascribed to the communists. The aim is the same: to artificially whip up panic in a bourgeois country and prompt the military to carry out a coup d'etat.

Simultaneously with their hopes placed in rightwing generals in the West, the neofascists are gambling on entirely different forces on another continent, on those whom the old fascism could not even have thought of. But the present-day pupils of Hitler are putting entirely special hopes in them. These are the Maoists in China itself.

There can be no doubt that Beijing is today playing duets not only with the dictators in South America; the Maoists are even more interested in West European fascism. The reasons are clear.

International fascism aspires in foreign policy to precisely that about which the present-day Mandarins dream day and night: the creation of a global aggressive anti-Soviet alliance. Beijing also favors a third world war. This is sufficient for collusion.

The neofascists, particularly across the Elbe, know that the Maoists support them, if as yet only secretly. "With China against the Soviets—here lies a world-historical opportunity, particularly for us Germans!" Munich's neo-Nazi newspaper DEUTSCHE NATIONAL-ZEITUNG proclaimed on 1 September 1978. Differences in the sides' official ideology are of no practical significance for either. The frenzied anti-Sovietism common to both of them is what counts.

The future will show whether or not direct contacts have already been organized between them, as between the PRC and Chile. This cannot be ruled out. When a delegation of old Hitlerite generals arrived in China, they were greeted as close friends and were shown much which is not shown to others.

One way or another, the neofascists see secret collusion with the Maoists as a further argument for switching to the offensive. It does absolutely no harm for the conspirators in Europe to have an ally in Asia.

We have been speaking of the neofascists' new personal and new allies. But there is also the question of their funds. Who is providing them with money? What resources are they living on as they form their new detachments?

Any but membership dues. These can be ruled out. Their activity is beginning to assume such proportions that they cannot be financing themselves. They are being helped.

It has already been mentioned that the exacerbating crisis of the capitalist world is objectively contributing to the mobilization of neofascism. Decay attracts the rats. But a certain subjective factor is also undoubtedly working in a direct manner to the benefit of neofascism. It is becoming increasingly clear that those influential forces in the West who for years have been conducting a feverish backstage campaign against the idea of a reduction in armaments--the millionaires dealing in weapons of mass destruction--are now interested in bringing the neofascists to a condition of combat readiness. It is widely known what part these circles play in our day in the policy of the imperialist powers. What is new is that in the 1970's the international military-industrial complex has clearly begun to increase its subsidies to the neofascists. This is being done in various ways, including indirectly, by distributing major concerns' advertising to shady fascist publications. This is taking place perfectly legally. Such a practice is particularly noticeable in West Germany.

Such firms as Siemens and AEG-Telefunken (electronics), Messerschmidt (aircraft, rockets, satellites), Flick and (Kvandt) (tanks, engines, firearms) and Bayer (chemicals and nuclear engineering) are considered the leading military monopolies in the FRG with turnovers of many billions of Deutschmark. All these firms place paid advertisements in neo-Nazi sheets, as if some fascist thug might acquire a tank or rocket carrier. It is also said that F.-J. Strauss, leader of the West German revanchists, who has close connections with the old Hitlerite Messerschmidt concern, enjoys considerable popularity among the neo-Nazis.

In Italy tracks of long standing lead to the fascists from the powerful Pirelli finance group, which has an interest in supplies for the military industry, in Portugal from the (Liznave) ship-building concern, to whom General Spínola is close, and so forth.

Of course, money does not only flow to the neofascist organizations from the military monopolies alone. As the West German newspaper KOELNER STADT-ANZEIGER reported in March 1978, the neo-Nazies are also being subsidized by old Hitlerites who have grown rich since the war and some "anonymous associations"--probably agents disposing of secret funds of the old Nazi Party.

But the keys to the cashbox are still in the hands of those who fear peaceful coexistence and a slump in arms production more than anything. These circles have evidently concluded in recent years that in the event of an exacerbation of the international situation military-fascist regimes in Europe, under the guardianship of the Pentagon and NATO, will be preferable to all others. If the international military-industrial complex subsequently finally resolves to take this route and opens its pocketbooks even wider

to the camp of the extreme right, we will hardly be able to rule out the possibility of serious outbreaks of the neofascist plague.

A further question. How, to judge by everything, are the fascists planning on this occasion to operate on an continental scale? What is their strategy if viewed within the framework of all of West Europe? In other words, where are they now thinking of starting and finishing?

Immediately after the war, in the acute "cold war" period, the international neofascist center definitely believed that it was most correct to attempt to again strike at Europe from the center of the continent—from where Hitler began. The original plan was, in collusion with former Wehrmacht generals and revanchist figures of Adenauer's rightwing party then ruling in Bonn, to suddenly seize power on the Rhine and then come to an amicable arrangement with the anti-Soviet powers of the West.

But the military did not dare act at that time, so soon after the war. Adenauer preferred to retain power for himself. The United States and Britain did not wish to excite world public opinion. The conspiracy, which subsequently became known as the "Naumann conspiracy" (he was then the secret leader of the Nazis and SS), collapsed, and there was no second Hitler.

After this, there was a long period of stagnation in the affairs of international fascism. Its forces began to melt away, and arguments and quarrels in its headquarters grew more frequent. And it was only in the 1970's that the new decision was finally made: to turn to the south and southwest of the continent and concentrate on the siege of another seething region in West Europe—the Mediterranean.

The goal was the creation of a neofascist Rome-Paris-Madrid-Lisbon-Athens axis. Instead of the "Hitler system," it was decided to resume the "Mussolini system" as the most promising after the war. What was not successful on the Rhine was, according to the new plan, to succeed on the shores of the Latin sea.

There is every reason to believe that this idea is being pursued to this day by the neofascist center operating in Rome—despite a number of failures that have occurred in the course of such attempts. A secret meeting of France's leading neofascist organization, New Order, with representatives of similar groups in Italy, Spain, Belgium and Greece was convened in January last year in Lyon. This same plan was obviously discussed.

The motives prompting the neofascist strategists to aim primarily for the south are understandable.

On 20 April 1945, 8 days before Mussolini's execution by the Italian partisans, he declared in his final newspaper interview: "20 years of fascism (in Italy--E.G.) was not enough. A greater man than I will bring the fascist idea to victory. If the allies (the anti-Hitler coalition of the

war years--E.G.) are victorious, a third world war is inevitable. But that will be Italy's hour, if it finds a person to play the trump card."

Present-day fascists in the Mediterranean countries believe that Mussolini's prediction may very soon come true. It is easy to imagine their reasoning. It is not even a matter of their possessing a comparatively large party in Italy. Their "geopoliticians" proceed primarily from the fact that the exacerbating class struggle in this country could, under certain circumstances, prompt NATO's southern headquarters here to threaten armed intervention against the left forces. Washington has repeatedly hinted quite strongly at such a possibility.

In this case the fascists would immediately be required by the interventionists and the military connected therewith as a terrorist guard. At the same time, moving on beyond Italy, the military-fascist wave should sweep over other Mediterranean countries, primarily France, where the intensity of the class struggle is also high, and also Spain and Portugal.

It should be added that events in the Near East, which so excited the imperialist camp last year, also strengthen the neofascists in their conviction that their main thrust should be aimed at the Mediterranean. Their secret alliance with the left extremists precisely in this region points to this.

Such plans cannot be considered an idle fantasy. In preparing the thrust for the south of West Europe the neofascists are counting on achieving what they failed to achieve in the years immediately after the war by attempts to begin from West Germany: collusion, albeit secret, with the Atlantic imperialists.

Such are their present dispositions. They intend to act, and precisely on our continent. To clear out of Europe and move on to some other part of the world--to Latin America, for example, as some people once thought about--would be tantamount to political suicide for them. But the belated followers of Hitler and Mussolini, these germs in the body of the planet, wish, as before, to live--to live to strangle mankind.

But something else will be decisive. Antifascism in our day is many times stronger than fascism. The main thing is the unity of its forces.

A final question: does present-day fascism really have a chance of achieving anything?

No one can, of course, assert in advance that neofascist (particularly military-fascist) adventures in this spot of the capitalist world or the other are immediately doomed to certain failure. If the strategists of imperialism decide to bring the fascist reserves into play at a critical moment, as was done in 1973 in Chile and in 1967 in Greece, they will undoubtedly attempt to act most decisively, granting the profascist conspirators all necessary resources.

Another point is also indisputable, however. The correlation of forces within every large capitalist country has changed fundamentally in favor of antifascism in our time compared with the 1930's and 1940's. This is perfectly apparent, for example, precisely in such former fascist countries in Europe as Italy, Spain, Portugal and Greece. There can be no doubt that the forces of the workers movement in the West have grown immeasurably since the war. The communists, in particular, are of an entirely different magnitude today than earlier. Antifascists now know that to allow themselves to be taken unawares a second time would be an unprecedented catastrophe.

No less important is the fact that the international correlation of forces has also changed just as sharply in favor of antifascism in the second half of the century. Imperialism is no longer in a position to dictate its will to the peoples as before.

Of course, it is not only a question of the correlation of forces. The question of the coordination of the policy of the antifascists is of exceptional importance, as before. If they resist the enemy with closed ranks and act aggressively, not delaying the mobilization of the popular masses and not forfeiting the initiative because of unnecessary friction, as in the past, fascism, despite all its latest methods and refinements, will not pass on this occasion and it will have no future. But the combat collaboration of the left forces on our and other continents coordinated ahead of time is an indispensable prerequisite of this. The main thing now also is their unity.

COPYRIGHT: Zhurnal "Novyy mir", 1980

8850

CSO: 1800

INTERNATIONAL

SOVIETS TROUBLED BY RECENT IRANIAN STATEMENTS

West Berlin DIE WELT in German 29 Mar 80 p 5

[Article by Dietrich Mummendey: "The Revolutionary, Khomeyni and the Kremlin's Troubles"]

[Text] America's political fiasco in Iran was a gift from Allah for the Soviet Union. The Kremlin's atheistic propagandists greeted Khomeyni as a "revolutionary." Moscow even quietly swallowed anti-Soviet statements, which the new Iranian government makes freely, for the sake of the new friendship it was hoping for.

But recently the Kremlin has appeared irritated. A statement by Iranian Foreign Minister Ghotbzadeh according to which Moscow had in principle declared its readiness to conduct talks with Iran and other countries of that region about an end to fighting in Afghanistan was rejected as being "strange, to say the least."

Moscow has also reacted to Iran's repeated protests to the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan with a special propaganda reversal. TASS, the official news agency, claims that Soviet action in Afghanistan saved Iran from an American blockade or something worse.

TASS argued that if the United States had succeeded in making Afghanistan a "springboard for American provocations" it would have threatened Iran too.

If the U.S.S.R. with its "principled and unswerving politics" had not opposed all attempts at intervention, "the United States would have positioned its naval armada along the Iranian coast," says another TASS commentary. "Moscow is signaling Tehran not to be too 'ungrateful' and to soften its anti-Soviet stand somewhat," speculates a Western diplomat.

But it is not just unfriendly words that Moscow has to take: After the Soviets and the Iranians could not agree on a new price for Iranian natural gas Tehran stopped all gas exports. Moscow had to resign itself to getting only 25 percent of the originally contracted amount in the future. It offered three times the price that the shah had demanded—to no avail.

The Soviet leadership keeps such unpleasantness from its own people. The dilemma is covered up with propaganda chin-ups. Tehran is not addressed directly. Instead a commentary in the WASHINGTON POST gives them an excuse. It states that Khomeyni sees now that Iran is threatened by the Soviet Union. But TASS does not mention at all what Khomeyni said. It only talks of the United States' lies of propaganda.

Meanwhile Khomeyni had declared on the occasion of the Iranian New Year: "The danger from communist powers is no smaller than that from America." Shamran, Iran's minister of defense, agreed: "The Iranian government understands very well that the Russians would attack us if there were no American pressure and vice versa." And Iran's President Bani-Sadr declares: "We cannot tolerate the presence of Soviet troops in our vicinity."

Until now Moscow was probably of the opinion that one should not weigh Tehran's rhetoric very heavily but that one should rather wait until the tumult is over. The Soviets' main goal in Iran remains to push America away and to ingratiate itself.

Because of this Moscow is quietly sanctioning the taking of American diplomats as hostages in Tehran and is supporting the "just demand" for the return of the deposed shah. Therefore the Communist Tudeh Party is being ordered by Moscow to cooperate with Khomeyni, even though their party organ is forbidden. And so the Soviet press, in contrast to Western media, is handling Iran with kid gloves. The fact that Tehran is nevertheless demonstratively distancing itself from both superpowers equally is a bitter pill for Moscow to swallow.

How important Iran is to the Kremlin is obvious from the fact that Moscow recently repeated Brezhnev's warning of November 1978, when a U.S. action to save the shah's regime seemed possible: "Every kind of intervention, especially military intervention, in the affairs of Iran, a country that has direct borders with the Soviet Union, would be seen by the Soviet Union as an act that would touch on its own security interests."

9232

CSO: 1826

NATIONAL

MEDVEDEV ON ANTHRAX EPIDEMIC, NUCLEAR ACCIDENT IN URALS

Milan PANORAMA in Italian 14 Apr 80 pp 214-225

[Article by Zhores A. Medvedev: "Mystery in the Urals"]

[Text] There is a "Bermuda Triangle" in the USSR from which comes terrible news: The latest one is about a mysterious epidemic of "Siberian ulcer." It all began with a nuclear accident concerning which even Western intelligence services kept silent. A Russian scientist in exile reconstructs the bewildering affair for PANORAMA.

The epidemic took place last spring and Soviet scientists attributed it to natural causes: A normal bacterial infection (Siberian ulcer or anthrax) that came from pathogenic germs that spread from animal carcasses. It caused rapid pulmonary collapse, paralysis and death. But many Western observers, particularly Americans, thought the bacteria responsible for the epidemic, which caused hundreds of deaths, was not so "natural." What spread the illness was said to be a serious accident in a Soviet plant for the production of bacteriological weapons.

What makes this version credible, in addition to the reticence of Soviet authorities to admit the existence of the epidemic, is above all the place where it happened: A sort of "Bermuda Triangle" bordered by two industrial centers (Sverdlovsk, formerly Ykaterinburg and Chelyabinsk) which is a little more than 100 km away and is closed to tourists. Terrifying events have happened there over the past 20 years.

The reason is simple: Important plants for military research and development are located in this technological "Bermuda Triangle" to the east of the Urals. These research and develop mainly nuclear and bacteriological weapons. To faithfully reconstruct what happens in this region is almost impossible in a short period of time and therefore today it cannot be demonstrated that the anthrax epidemic really was caused by an accident in a bacteriological weapons plant.

However an analogy can be advanced: About 22 years ago, in this same area, there was a catastrophic accident in a plant for treatment of nuclear wastes. The Soviet Union continues to deny it even today and for years qualified Western experts have maintained that it was pure fantasy, that a treatment plant cannot explode like an atomic bomb. Today, however, even the CIA has had to admit that it was not fantasy and that it was the scientists who most opposed this hypothesis--those in the most important American Atomic Laboratory at Oak Ridge--who finally recognized 2 months ago that they were wrong. Must we wait another 20 years to find out the truth about Siberian ulcer?

Proof that the nuclear catastrophe in the Urals actually took place was supplied by dissident Soviet biologist Zhores Medvedev, who has been in exile in London since 1973. PANORAMA asked him to reconstruct the story. What follows is the most complete reconstruction of the greatest nuclear disaster, after Hiroshima and Nagasaki, that ever has been published.

DOCUMENT

In 1976 when for the first time I told, in an article for the American magazine NEW SCIENTIST, what I recalled regarding the Cheljabinsk-40 (a plant situated in the southern Urals) nuclear tragedy of the 1957-1958 winter, I unexpectedly was faced by a wall of distrust and hostility. The unanimous and immediate reaction of all the top nuclear scientists both American and European was to consider my reconstruction completely unrealistic and bordering on delirium. Offended and scandalized statements by the Western experts abounded in the newspapers: Some described my story as "fantasy science" or "fruit of the imagination," while others merely called it "a massive foolishness" while still others even questioned my good faith.

It was really a shock for me. At that time I had been living in London for 3 years (I worked as a biologist at the National Institute for Medical Research) but in all that time, also because of work commitments that had prevented me from following the ongoing debate regarding problems of nuclear energy, it had not even occurred to me that the story of the 1957 nuclear disaster in the Soviet Union was entirely unknown in the west.

It did not seem true to me. And I was still more surprised when I realized that none of the top scientists in the world would believe my story. And yet I was certain that the nuclear accident had really happened, and I also knew that it was caused by the explosion of a deposit of radioactive waste in the main Russian military atomic center (at Kyshtym) in the southern Urals and that in addition to contaminating an area of more than 2,500 square km with radioactive isotopes, it had caused the death of a very high but unknown number of persons. But I could not prove it: I did not have evidence, I could not exhibit documents and facts that could be investigated and verified by other scientists. I could only appeal to my memory and to my good faith. But evidently this was not enough.

I was disappointed and perplexed, I did not know how I could counteract the criticisms of the skeptics when, unexpectedly, about a month after the publication of my article, the first important confirmation of my reconstruction came from Israel. In December 1976 the JERUSALEM POST published the eyewitness testimony of another Russian scientist, the molecular biologist Lev Tumermann, who emigrated to Israel in 1972 and is working at the Weizmann Institute. Tumermann told about his automobile trip several years before between the two major cities of the industrial area of the southern Urals, Sverdlovsk and Chelyabinsk. About 100 km past Sverdlovsk a road sign said there was to be no stopping for any reason and that maximum speed was to be maintained for the next 30 km. Tumermann reported, "On both sides of the road all forms of life had disappeared, had been destroyed: There were no villages, there were no houses, only here and there there were brick chimneys, all that remained of the dwellings that had been razed. The fields were not cultivated, there were no animals, there was not a soul alive ... nothing whatever."

Tumermann continued, "Afterward I told myself that that was the area of the famous Kyshtyn catastrophe in which many hundreds of persons had been killed or permanently disabled."

Tumermann wrote that all the persons with whom he had spoken, both scientists and ordinary citizens, had given him the same explanation of the causes of the disaster: It was the explosion of a deposit of radioactive nuclear waste near the Chelyabinsk-40 nuclear plant (40 is the number of a post office box: A system adopted in the USSR to hide the real location of secret military installations). Again, Tumermann's testimony was based on personal recollection, and this could not be exhibited as "proof," but was enough to give me confidence in the possibility of demonstrating the truth of what I had said.

Meanwhile, his story had created disagreement and discussion in the entire Western press, above all because of the enormous extent, according to his reconstruction, of the area that was said to have been involved in the disaster.

In fact, it was enough to glance at a map to get an idea of the extent of the accident. If the portion of "dangerous" road was about 30 km long, as Tumermann said, and if the contaminated area extended along both sides of the road, west toward Kyshtyn and east toward the city of Kamensk-Uralsky, considering that the distance by road from the nuclear center of Kyshtyn was at least 40 km, it could be deduced that the area involved in the accident had to extend over several hundreds of square km.

No one wanted to believe it: Most scientists now admitted that something could have happened in that area, but they tended to exclude the idea that it was a nuclear accident and in any case they considered an accident of such proportions to be impossible.

Regarding the hypothesis, advanced by Tumermann and myself, of an accident caused by the explosion of a deposit of nuclear wastes, the Western scientists mostly believed that in any case an accident of that kind could not have caused such extended damage. Yet the description given by Tumermann was absolutely exact and I knew it well. In fact, not only had I myself listened to many similar descriptions from persons who in those years had had occasion to travel to that area, but at that time, I also knew some scientists who worked in the contaminated zone and studied the effects of radioactivity on animals and on all forms of life.

They had told me that there had been danger signals even around the forests, the lakes and the rivers and that hunting and fishing had been prohibited in the entire southern Ural area. So far as I know some of these restrictions still exist today.

In the spring of 1977, I had the idea of investigating some Russian scientific magazines which published studies on radioecology, radiobiology and research on genetic mutations. Not only did I know the names of many scientists who had worked in the contaminated area, but I was also convinced that if they had begun to publish the results of their studies it would not be difficult to recognize their research. I knew that the authors could not give explicit information on the place of research in their studies, but I was confident I could find the necessary indicators in order to distinguish between a casual and uncontrolled accident such as that of Kyshtym from normal programmed and controlled contamination experiments.

The descriptions of local flora and fauna, for example, would have made it possible for me to acquire further confirmation on the area of the accident. And this both because that zone contained some rare species of animals and plants that were not found elsewhere, and because an accident of such dimensions would have made it possible for the first time to study also some types of animals such as deer-like animals or some kinds of predatory birds which because of their migratory habits had been previously excluded from all controlled contamination experiments.

Soon I realized that my method of investigation was beginning to bear fruit: The picture of the great nuclear disaster in the Chelyabinsk region began to look sharper.

Some authors had chosen for their studies, and they justified this with scarcely credible excuses, the great lakes contaminated with strontium 90, cerium 144 and cesium 137. Also, the level of contamination was clearly higher than could have been expected by a controlled contamination experiment. More than 100,000 Curies of radioactive fission waste had been dumped into one lake alone with a surface area of about 4.5 square km and the results of studies on this lake had been compared with those done on the progressive decrease of radioactivity, year by year, in another larger lake whose surface was 10.3 square km.

At the same time, a third lake of equal size and capacity had been used as a model to study the effects of the radioactivity of strontium 90 and cesium 137 on different kinds of fish.

Dozens of other studies were made on an ecosystem that was so highly contaminated as to cause a general decrease of the average life of all kinds of animals, including the smallest. In many cases there was a drastic mutation of the type and number of the kinds of terrestrial animals present. Geneticists maintained that the animals as well as the plants had suffered chromosome damage of various kinds. Finally, the geologists had been able to study the distribution of radioactive isotopes in various kinds of terrains, some of which were situated very far from the center of the contaminated area. All these studies were carried out in the same area: This could be deduced from many indicators. Similarly evident was the fact that research had been carried out on a contaminated area of enormous dimensions and that it had been started in 1958.

When I discovered that one of the more interesting research projects had been carried out, by the explicit admission of the author, in the region of Chelyabinsk I no longer had any doubts and I decided to publish a second article.

This time, too, I published in the American magazine NEW SCIENTIST, in June 1977 and this time, too, polemics and discussions broke out. But unlike the first article, the evidence I produced to support my theses was much more extensive. Thus, the reactions were much different.

A group of American ecologists (belonging to the Natural Resources Defense Council) on the basis of the recently approved Freedom of Information Act tried to see the CIA documents regarding the nuclear accident in the Soviet Union.

None of us then knew whether the CIA had any material on the Chelyabinsk accident. They could easily have told us that they had no documentation. That was not so in this case. The CIA sent to the WASHINGTON POST, as well as to me and to the group of ecologists who had asked for it, a detailed list with the titles of about 30 documents pulled from its files. These had such titles as: "Radioactive Contamination in an Area of Chelyabinsk-Oblast," "Nuclear Explosion at Chelyabinsk-40," etc. Some of the documents went back to 1957-1959; others were collected much later.

Many paragraphs, still considered "secret," had been censored, along with about half the documents which were not delivered. But those we received contained more than enough proof to affirm without any more doubt that the nuclear disaster in the Chelyabinsk zone had happened.

Most of the CIA "sources" spoke of contamination over very extensive areas with radioactive nuclear waste. The documents in such a censored form did not in themselves make it possible to arrive at definite conclusions, but

compared with publications on radioecology that I had collected earlier, they in themselves made it possible to arrive at conclusions on what was omitted in the newspapers that published long excerpts in November 1977.

It was no longer possible to summarize the entire affair in one or even a series of articles. I thus decided to collect all the material into a book which I finished writing in March 1978. It was published in American, German and Italian editions in June 1979. (Atomic Disaster in the USSR, a Catastrophe That the Soviets and Americans Kept Secret, Vallecchi, publisher.)

This time all the most important Western scientific institutions were forced to take a position. The dominant attitude did not question the fact that a nuclear accident had occurred, but contested both the cause I indicated (that is, the defective method of storing radioactive waste), and the geographical size of the contaminated area (which I estimated at more than 2,500 square km).

After all, if the quantity of radioactive material emitted into the environment (above all strontium 90 and cesium 137) had really been what I said in my book (tens of millions of Curies) on the basis of the Russian studies investigated, there should not have been any doubt about the fact that what for many years had been the largest storage depot of nuclear wastes built by man was involved in the accident.

The picture I had reconstructed of the disaster in fact accorded perfectly with the hypothesis of an accident that had hurled into the surrounding environment (also thanks to wind action) a quantity of radioactive waste equal to that which approximately would have been accumulated after several years of production by plants for the treatment of plutonium in the southern Urals.

Regarding the extent of the contaminated area, I had, in my calculations, considered both the evidence I and Tumermann had gathered as well as the possible fauna in an area such as that of the southern Urals.

On the basis of data from Soviet scientific literature, taking into account the number of animals studied by scientists and the criteria of sampling adopted, and knowing the average animal population of the various species in the area, it was relatively simple to work back to the dimensions of the contaminated area. Western experts (particularly the Oak Ridge ecologists and J. H. Frenlin, of the University of Birmingham) responded to my estimates by hypothesizing that one or more minor accidents had occurred and by questioning the method I used in calculating the dimensions of the area involved.

According to them, even if the criteria I used were to be considered scientifically valid, the hypothesis could not be dismissed that the Russian scientists had not merely taken samples of the animal population, but had

had to kill all the animals in the contaminated area in order to avoid spreading the damage to other areas. In this case, on the basis of the method of calculation that I also had adopted, the size of the contaminated area was estimated at about 25 square km.

But these were very weak arguments. Not only had it been easy for me to demonstrate that there had been only one accident (it was enough to check the starting dates of all the radioecology studies considered: They all went back to 1958), but I could also prove that the hypothesis of killing all contagious animals was completely unfounded.

Killing all the animals would have been justified only if it had been done immediately after the accident, in 1958 or at the latest in 1959, and in that case the entire contaminated area would have had to be fenced off at the same time to prevent entrance by other animals. Instead the studies by the Soviet scientist showed unequivocally that samples of contaminated animals (thousands of mammals of various kinds and more than 1000 birds) had been killed later, at different times, up until 1976. Furthermore, it was known that hunting had been forbidden in the entire region and that for many years at Chelyabinsk and Sverdlovsk and in other communities near the contaminated area all meat sold in the markets had been checked with Geiger counters.

Fremlin also advanced another hypothesis. From the very high levels of contamination of the environment (as high as from 1000 to 4000 Curies of strontium 90 per square km), he argued that if the catastrophe had been caused by an accident to the waste storage facility, it would necessarily have had to involve the total amount of accumulated waste. This was the hypothesis that I advanced in my book. But according to Fremlin, the hypothesis was not credible, making it necessary to advance an alternative interpretation: An accidental explosion of a hydrogen bomb.

However, neither would this interpretation stand up in view of the documentation I had gathered in my book. There was no damage or devastation that could be attributed to a violent explosion around the area of the accident: The forests had not been leveled to the ground, but had died slowly because of the high concentration of strontium 90; neither Kyshtyn nor Kasly, the closest cities, had been destroyed, and the small villages which according to Tumermann's evidence were razed, had actually simply been burned by men (as could be seen by the fact that the brick chimneys had remained standing).

The hypothesis of an explosion therefore was impossible. Furthermore, if there had really been an explosion of an H-bomb, it is very unlikely that it would not have been observed in the entire West because the higher strata of the atmosphere would inevitably have been contaminated.

Along the lines of the Fremlin interpretation, four scientists of the famous Los Alamos Research Laboratory (including H. Agnew, ex-director

of the laboratory) finally advanced, in an article published on 26 October 1979 in the magazine SCIENCE, a further hypothesis. According to them the military experiments involving the explosion of "dirty" H-bombs in the atmosphere, in 1957 or 1958, on an Arctic island, Novaya Zemlya (where the Russians had actually carried out nuclear experiments) could have created a radioactive cloud that then could have been transported by the wind to the south for 2,000 km (evidently always staying at an altitude above 2,000 meters in order to be able to cross the Ural Mountains) and then to precipitate precisely in the Kyshtym area.

However, there were many objections to such a hypothesis and they could be overcome only with great difficulty. First of all the wind: If, as the authors themselves recognized, the dominant winds in the area usually go in an entirely different direction, it becomes very risky to imagine the possibility of "anomalous atmospheric conditions" capable of transporting a radioactive cloud for thousands of km until it precipitates it precisely above the Soviet nuclear military center.

But if the authors of this "tale" had really read my book, and I don't believe they did, they would have found much additional information that cannot logically be explained in a scenario such as the one they proposed.

In a very interesting study of the radioactive fallout over forests, indications had been, for example, that there were two effective sizes of radioactive particles in the Chelyabinsk area: Up to 50 and up to 100 microns. Particles of such size cannot in any way be transported for such distances: They are too heavy. The wind could have transported them for several hours at most, but certainly not for entire days.

Furthermore, according to the research of Soviet scientists, the radioactive contamination in the area was very irregular, even in very small portions of less than one hectare, a thing that would not have been in any way understandable if the theory of the Los Alamos scientists were true.

Even today, polemics on the nuclear disaster in the Soviet Union have not been satisfied and probably discussion will continue for considerable time. Probably until the Soviet scientists themselves who conducted the research in those years make a decisive contribution to reconstruct the full picture of the incident.

But if they do it some day it will be of great help to Western nuclear experts and to Soviet scientists The total censorship existed at that time and which probably still exists around the nuclear sector probably has created a situation in which only a very few super-experts such as the most recent nuclear czar, Igor Kurchatov, have knowledge of the entire picture of the incident. And certainly those people have done all they can to minimize the dimensions of the incident: And in cases such as this secrecy creates corruption and irresponsibility.

The government evidently had no interest in getting to the bottom of the investigations. To investigate thoroughly would have meant uncovering conspiracies of silence and unleashing polemics: It was better to keep quiet and not look for trouble. And then why should they have publicized their failures?

But the most serious thing is that that very attitude in recent years has become common to the entire world "nuclear club." For this reason my research effort has always been seen in the east as well as the west as an attempted deception. I recall that in 1978, when I visited the Los Alamos Laboratory, I faced my most determined accuser, Edward Teller, the American "father" of the H-bomb. At that time Teller accused me of gratuitously and without proof spreading panic among American public opinion. And it was his collaborator, H. Agnew, who solemnly declared to the press, "Medvedev is creating alarm without possessing even the slightest proof of what he says: We put him with his back to the wall and he was not capable of supplying even one name of the alleged victims of the disaster."

It is true, I do not know the names of the victims of the accident. But I have seen with my own eyes the X-rays of the lungs of various persons who died by having breathed highly radioactive particles. And I saw under the microscope the chromosome abnormalities of human cells exposed to radiation. I don't know the names of these persons, but I do know they are dead. And if I have written my book on the most serious nuclear disaster ever to occur in peacetime, I did not do it to add luster to the reputations of Teller and Kurchatov: They certainly do not need my help. I did it to commemorate the unknown victims who died under the crossfire of the cold war.

Photo Captions

Detail map of the place in the southern Ural Mountains where the nuclear accident happened in 1957. Area in red is where the most serious damage to the people and environment was caused. Left: same area on a map of Europe.

6034

CSO: 3104

NATIONAL

'PRAVDA' DISCUSSION OF AGRICULTURAL PROBLEMS CONTINUES

Responsibility for Field Operations

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 30 Mar 80 p 2

[Article by P. Voytyuk, chairman of the Kolkhoz imeni Grin'ko and I. Kotov, chairman of the professional trade union committee at the kolkhoz, Shipunovskiy Rayon, Altayskiy Kray: "Be Very Demanding of Oneself"]

[Text] We would like to continue the discussion started by V. Yaganshin in the article entitled "Demand and Entrust" [PRAVDA, 16 January], concerning the role of agricultural specialists. Beyond any doubt, this role is increasing. The word of an agronomist or zootechnician is viewed as law by a machine operator or livestock breeder. This applies in particular if the specialist is an intelligent, knowledgeable and competent individual. The chief of our Crop Husbandry Department, G. Pokusayev, is this type of individual. He possesses an excellent knowledge of agricultural practices and he is a skilled organizer. He has accomplished a great deal in connection with the introduction of a soil-protection system of farming and scientifically sound crop rotation plans and he has organized seed production in a fine manner. During the current five-year plan, the cropping power of the grain crops increased by more than 3 quintals and presently amounts to 18 quintals. Moreover, the proportion of high quality and valuable grain has increased from 45 to 92 percent.

Certainly, these were not the results of work performed by just one specialist -- but rather the entire agronomic service and the machine operators. Nevertheless, communist G. Polisayev made a great personal contribution. He is an energetic and industrious individual. He recognizes his field responsibilities as being extensive in scope. Gennadiy Aleksandrovich has skilfully applied himself to solving the livestock feed problems. He created a land reclamation brigade and directed its operations. Today we have an irrigated tract of 540 hectares. Here we are obtaining high forage crop yields.

The majority of the kolkhoz's 30 specialists are applying themselves in the same conscientious and enthusiastic manner: chief veterinary doctor

A. Peregudov, zootechnician V. Bogoyavlenskiy and others. As a rule, these are skilled individuals possessing considerable practical experience.

In personnel training and education, we are guided by the well known decree of the CPSU Central Committee concerning work with agricultural specialists in Altayskiy Kray. Special attention is being given to the younger generation. Authority does not come with a diploma. It must be earned. The principal concern here is -- thorough knowledge of the work assigned and the ability to establish correct relationships with the collective. We assign the novices to an economic school and we strive to place greater trust in our specialists. This is considered to be a very effective training method.

Unfortunately, blunders and errors usually occur in this work. We were pleased to welcome zootechnician S. Vostrikov. He is a young, intelligent and energetic individual. We entrusted a heifer raising complex to his care. This complex for 3,500 head of young stock is a complicated farm. We hoped that the zootechnician would be flattered by such trust and justify our confidence in him. But S. Vostrikov did not attempt to study thoroughly his responsibilities and, as a result, he committed a number of serious mistakes. We tried to correct him. He became offended and went to another farm.

Nor was this a singular incident. Some specialists consider themselves to be nothing more than production consultants. They maintain that their only task is to see to it that the technology is not disrupted. They are wrong in this belief. An agronomist or engineer is a production organizer and their responsibilities include teaching the collective. At the kolkhoz, based upon initiative displayed by the party committee and the professional trade union committee for middle echelon personnel, an appropriate title was established: specialist-organizer.

A great deal is being accomplished at the present time, at our farm and on other farms, in the interest of raising their prestige. What makes this necessary? A brigade leader who lacks a secondary education has a scientist-agronomist working under him. Nor is pride the only factor involved here. It turns out that the technologist was not responsible for the practical results of management. That is why not every individual strives to display initiative. Yes and the material incentives were negligible: wages of 120-130 rubles per month. Today the rate for an agronomist-organizer is 210 rubles.

The range of concerns of a specialist has become much more extensive. It is very important for him not to expend his energy on matters of secondary concern or carry out tasks which lie within the capability of less qualified individuals. Quite often one hears the following words being uttered in a respectful manner: "the comrade is very enthusiastic over his work." But here one must examine, so to speak, the effect and meaning of the term "enthusiasm." Permit us to cite just such an example. One of

our tractor engineers is V. Ryndin. How does this expert in his field utilize his talents? Instead of teaching others how best to carry out their obligations, he rolls up his sleeves and is content to tinker with motors and transmissions. Whenever you see him, he is carrying a monkey-wrench and a screw driver. Many of the machine operators have forgotten how to handle difficulties. Whenever a problem develops, they say: "Volodya, you go ahead and fix it."

Such individuals are admired. But do they always respect or carry out their obligations? Only in those instances where simplicity and accessibility are combined with a high level of exactingness. We spoke about this to V. Ryndin. It is to his credit that he recognized his mistakes: he must demand more from each individual with regard to their assigned sector of work and he must display concern for improving the organization of labor and the highly productive utilization of the tractor pool.

At times, there are those who adopt a condescending approach with regard to connivance and feebleness in a specialist, forgetting that these qualities cause the interests of the work to suffer. For example, herdsmen P. Chechulin and G. Katyshev disturbed the feed ration for the animals. The head of the spetskhov, N. Bukovtsov, did not dare to hold the guilty parties responsible. On another occasion the specialists were not interested in learning why the daily increase in weight for G. Chetyrin's heifers was 1.2 kilograms and for Ye. Shishova's heifers -- only 370 grams.

As you can see, instead of random mistakes, these amounted to systematic violations of production technological discipline. Why did the chief of the livestock breeding department, P. Malina, tolerate these violations? This was the subject of a discussion held during a joint meeting of the party committee, professional trade union committee and the kolkhoz administration. The specialist did not wish to damage his relationships with his subordinates. Yes and formerly it was a matter of not wanting to become embroiled in all of the details: so much work, so many tasks. Certainly, these are not sound arguments.

Nevertheless, such complaints by specialists lead to serious thinking. Let us examine the flow of information coming from the rayon agricultural administration and other services -- one can understand the reason for sluggishness on the part of an agronomist or zootechnician. At times, one questions the lack of importance attached to certain instructions. It is maintained that snow retention work must be carried out on an urgent basis, seed must be cleaned and salt carried to the livestock. Is it possible that there are illiterate people on a farm, persons who do not know what they are supposed to do? If sluggishness and miscalculations are apparent, then they should be dealt with in a very strict manner. Based upon discussions with colleagues and press articles, we are aware that we are not the only ones bothered by such situations.

Definite recommendations and arrangements are required. But not petty guardianship nor a paper merry-go-round, as occur from time to time. On

each occasion they try to bring the specialist to the rayon center. Conferences, seminars and gatherings are viewed as being plus factors. Last year, this same G. Pokusayev was off traveling on 45 days. Moreover, he had to leave the farm during the busiest period.

The kray Altaysemprom Association, which includes our kolkhos, was created. A subunit of this service is located in Shipunovo. Thus its leaders bombarded us with telegrams: "Furnish us with such an such information..." The specialists are sitting down and writing. Nor is it in behalf of the fields that they recall their obligations - it is mainly in behalf of an institute which requested the next paper. It reaches the point of being absurd. The harvest operations are in full swing and a seed grower is required to answer 36 questions found on a questionnaire. For example, what is the weight of 1,000 grains? Such data can be obtained without difficulty from a laboratory worker at an elevator. And at the end of the year, this same specialist sat for 2 days with a report in the rayon agricultural administration and for 3 more days at Altaysemprom. Meanwhile, information which should have been included in the report by him had long ago been sent by us to the rayon and kray statistical administration. Thus, as a result of this type of "management," the specialists are losing large amounts of time and are failing to attach the proper value to it.

Comrade V. Yaganshik wrote correctly: a great amount of time is consumed in conducting different types of meetings and in composing summaries and references. Moreover, information can be required by any organization, upon which a farm is dependent to a certain degree. Indeed, preparations must be made for each statement and report. It is good when the inquiries are of the same type and use can be made of available documentation. Beyond any doubt, the role played by the production technologists must be raised. Only not by pulling.

The collective at our farm is performing in a stable manner. We are successfully fulfilling the plans for the sale of products. Last autumn we obtained the greatest harvest in the rayon. This was in large measure the result of work performed by our specialists. But we also have many complaints against them.

It is hoped that the rayon party committee will monitor more closely the work of the communists -- agronomists, zootechnicians and engineers. On more than one occasion, we offered to listen to the account of G. Pokusayev during a meeting of the bureau of the rayon party committee. The answer we received was: "It is a matter of secondary importance." Thus, if we are discussing the economy and its condition -- once again all are honorable and quite often reproaches are directed against the chairman and the secretary of the party committee. The specialist is in the dark. It is our opinion that, similar to the leaders, he must share the praise and penalties. There has never been a case of an agronomist being held responsible for a disruption in the soil cultivation technology or for crop losses or spoilage.

To entrust and to be demanding. This rule must be remembered by all those who are responsible for the status of the rural economy and for the selection and training of personnel.

Kolkhoz Efficiency Reviewed

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Mar 80 p 2

[Article by Ye. Novikov, deputy to USSR Supreme Soviet and chairman of Kolkhoz imeni 50-Letiya SSSR in Dubovskiy Rayon, Volgogradskaya Oblast: "Research Leads To Success"]

[Text] I read with interest in PRAVDA the letter sent in by the Chistyakov brothers -- field team leaders at the Kolkhoz imeni Lenin in Kalininskaya Oblast. Nor was I the only one who read it. I saw the newspaper lying on the work tables of many agricultural specialists and party workers throughout the rayon and oblast. Thus, it came as a surprise and yet it forces one to examine very thoroughly the responsibility for rural problems and the possible methods for solving them. I would like to lend support to the thoughts expressed and to continue this important discussion.

Allow me first to provide a brief description of our kolkhoz. Although an average farm, it is nevertheless economically strong. This was achieved as a result of implementation of the decisions handed down during the March (1965) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee. During the intervening years, substantial changes have taken place in the material-technical base of the enterprise. It is sufficient to state that formerly we had only 20 tractors and now we have 50. Yes and there were other changes as well. Earlier we consumed approximately 300,000 kilowatt hours of electric power annually and this year -- seven times more. Animal husbandry and feed production have been converted over to an industrial basis.

All of these factors necessarily affect the production of goods. Progress has been particularly noticeable during this current five-year plan. Thus, during the 4 year period, grain sales increased by more than twofold, milk by 42 percent and meat -- by 14 percent. The average annual gross output volume increased by one third and the profitability level was raised to almost 50 percent.

By no means were such indices achieved on rich chernozem soils. Our land is rather poor and there is no need to even mention the climatic conditions prevailing in the Volga steppe regions: torrid summers, hot dry winds, limited amounts of snow and cold winters. But even under such unfavorable conditions it is possible to work better and to utilize resources in a more efficient manner. Nor do I believe that this applies only to us.

During the past few years, all of the kolkhozes and sovkhoses have strengthened their material-technical base. Today this base is making it possible to achieve a noticeable increase in the principal types of products and to realize better work results in all areas. This can be

achieved by improving the mechanism for stimulating and planning agricultural production and by solving a number of other problems mentioned by the Chistyakov brothers. This represents ample food for thought by the scientists and by workers attached to Gosplan and to the USSR Ministry of Agriculture. In all probability, priority attention should be given to studying and generalizing the experience of those kolkhozes and sovkhozes which found a solution for this problem.

In any case, our kolkhoz attaches great importance to stimulating production in an effective manner. It was several years ago that we created an economic council for the kolkhoz, responsible for finding reserves for increasing the profitability for each type of product. The council was asked to review the plans for NOT (scientific organization of labor), the introduction of new equipment and technology and wages. A detailed analysis was carried out here of unproductive expenditures and their causes and measures were developed for eliminating them. One fact testifies to the authority of the council: if the reports by brigade leaders and farm leaders concerning proposed wages are not reviewed during a session of the council, the bookkeeping department is not authorized to compute the salaries.

Based upon initiative displayed by the council, a so-called home-bred system of economic accountability was introduced in all of the subunits. What is the essence of this system? A planned expenditure limit, in monetary terms, was established for each brigade and crude-limit lists were issued for the release of materials and spare parts from warehouses. The leader of an average team became a true master of the values entrusted to his care. In continuing the work, we eliminated small and unsuitable refueling stations at field camps. We created a central petroleum base having its own fuel delivery system. Today the equipment is being refueled out on the fields based upon the use of coupons. Regulations have been established for the technical maintenance of the tractors and combines. A master trouble-shooter now issues new coupons to a machine operator only after he has thoroughly inspected the equipment.

All material interest is directly dependent upon the profit obtained from the output, the production of which was carried out by a particular collective. We rejected the payment of bonuses throughout the year for intermediate indices, since this type of incentive, as mentioned by the Chistyakov brothers, has more negative than positive aspects. Conditional profitability and conditional net profit were initially introduced in unprofitable branches. Exactly what is this? For example, in dairy production the production cost achieved was taken as the base for the conditional profitability. It was established that when the production cost is lowered, a proportional increase takes place in the contributions made to the material incentive fund for livestock breeders. And other types of bonuses were coordinated with the final work results. After 2 years had elapsed, milk production provided us with 150,000 rubles worth of profit. Overall production profitability reached 43 percent. The need for determining the conditional profit disappeared.

There were also many "gaps" in field crop husbandry. On the basis of a decision handed down by the council, a "job contract plus bonus" system of wages was introduced here and it was coordinated with both the products produced and the production costs.

Certainly, such methods are to a large degree the result of independent action. But I emphasize once again that we concerned ourselves with it owing to the fact that in agriculture the mechanism for stimulating growth in labor productivity and the best use of land and available funds is not operating satisfactorily. We were simply forced into creating a somewhat home-bred and yet more effective system for raising the interest of individuals in the final results and in achieving a high level of profitability. The scientific organization of labor and the flexible use of material and moral stimuli serve to develop initiative and confidence in achieving overall success in each individual. Effective stimuli, good organization and discipline -- these are factors which are lacking at many kolkhozes and sovkhoses. The solving of these problems represents the "key" to increasing the production of goods and improving the cultural and spiritual life of rural workers and their welfare.

Permit me to refer once again to the experience of the kolkhoz. The increasing effectiveness of our economy enabled us to realize annual increases in the contributions made to the public consumption funds. We are issuing free sanatorium and tourist passes to all those desiring them and we are paying the travel expenses. We have introduced free meals in the schools. No payments are required for kindergarten attendance. The kolkhoz has undertaken to service and repair television sets and radios and it has opened a dental surgery. A standard working day has been introduced. The livestock breeders have 2 days off each week throughout the year and workers in other branches -- from November to March.

Could it be that these changes constitute the reason why the youth are not departing the farm, but rather are sinking deep roots into our not very fertile land? For example, let us take the Petrov family. The head of the family, Yakov Grigor'yevich, operated a tractor even prior to the war. And today he is still included among the machine operators. His sons, Yuriy and Viktor, are following in the steps of their father. The Gaydamakin dynasty is well known for its industry. Last year, milkmaids Nadezhda and Galina Gaydamakin obtained a milk yield of 350 tons of milk. One can easily understand the labor enthusiasm of many other kolkhoz members who have undertaken high obligations and are fulfilling them.

During the past few years, many delegations have visited the kolkhoz and acquainted themselves with the economic accountability system and the measures aimed at raising production efficiency. Some of our neighbors have even adopted certain elements of our experience. But for some reason, those desiring to do so were unable to borrow the entire system. I do not believe that this was the result of organizational difficulties or the notorious psychological barrier. The problem was considerably more complicated.

One reason lies in the fact that practically the same bonuses can be obtained today merely by over-fulfilling the plan in terms of gross volume, even though economic operations were clearly unprofitable. Gosbank issues credit for this purpose even though your account may be empty. Why then is there confusion with regard to a miscalculation of conditional profitability there? There is still another problem. Is it normal for very few individuals to be disturbed over the production cost level and the economic effectiveness of production? Indeed, even when summarizing the results of a competition or determining the winners, this aspect of the work of a collective is not being taken into account.

I would like to say a few words regarding planning. The importance of a single plan in agriculture is decreasing. It is losing its value as a law. A plurality of plans has appeared: there is a firm plan, a national economic plan, an additional plan and a counter plan. We leaders are beginning to become confused over them. And what about the rank and file workers?

But the real problem involves still another factor. Any more, planning is becoming more and more divorced from the real potential of a collective, the land or the material-technical base. As a rule, our recommendations are being ignored in the rayon and quite often completely unrealistic figures are thrust upon us. For example, the kolkhos was ordered to obtain 120 quintals of dry hay per hectare. This requires a minimum of eight waterings and yet only five are being planned. Just as in the past, tense tasks are being assigned to elements which are keeping pace with their work and, conversely, lowered tasks are being assigned to the backward and unprofitable farms. And the introduction of raised procurement prices for above-plan output has produced a situation wherein many leaders are concealing their reserves.

Certainly, there are many strong farms in our country where intelligent use is being made of each hectare of land, where the economic and social problems are being solved on a state basis and where the rural workers love their difficult work. However, facts of another type are also encountered. They are not typical and they cannot be ignored. It is believed that such a phenomenon is the result of parasitism and confidence in the fact that the state will come to the rescue and cover the obligations.

Yes, our state is rich. But the time is at hand, particularly in the rural areas, to measure with a high degree of accuracy the true potential and the final results of economic activity. We should never tolerate a situation wherein wages are divorced from labor productivity. For example, we speak a great deal about the economic effectiveness of production. At the same time, on a rayon and oblast scale, we forget to compare the output level, the production costs and the yield per hectare of arable land. Why is this? Should we stress the importance of a "gross volume" outlook? Indeed, in those areas where no concern is displayed for raising the effectiveness of labor, no increase will be achieved in gross production.

Improvements Required in System of Incentives

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 Mar 80 p 2

[Article by N. Kuznetsov, director of 40 Let Kazakhstan Sovkhoz in Teelinogradskaya Oblast: "Incentives For... Less Than Optimum Output"]

[Text] After reading the letter by the Chistyakov brothers in PRAVDA, I fell to thinking: even though the Kalininskaya Oblast fields are located at some distance from our Kazakhstan virgin land, we share similar concerns. It was for this reason that I was stung to the quick, as the saying goes, by the letter. In particular, I was disturbed by the statement that today a winning farm is one where the leaders, by means of both truths and untruths, "force through" an understated plan.

I recall how somewhat more than 4 years ago the figures for output sales for the new Tenth Five-Year Plan were "shaken down" in the rayon agricultural administration. I will not conceal the fact that I was quite disturbed over the type of plan assigned to the sovkhos. On many neighboring farms the land is no worse and in fact it is probably even better than our land and yet if we are to fulfill our task we must obtain 10-15 percent more grain per hectare.

"We have been placed in a difficult situation" I told the chief of the Planning and Economic Department of the administration, N. Grishchenko, "We will be ruined." "But what about the others?" asked Nikolay Nikolayevich, "You are concerned only with your own sovkhos, whereas I am besieged on all sides and must participate in heated arguments day after day."

The arguments are concerned with this same problem. Some will insist that their plan is too high and should be lowered. Some refer to a shortage of personnel, while others blame low profitability. But all ask for the same cure: to have their task lowered.

Perhaps it can be shown that unconscientious leaders do not perform with the best interests of the state in mind. Can this be true? I do not think so. Indeed, all sovkhos directors have been working for many years, they have passed through the stern school of the virgin lands and they value the interests of the state. There must be another reason. Actually, as stated by the Chistyakov brothers, a farm which succeeds in "forcing through" a low plan stands to gain. And one which outlines an optimum and more tense plan will lose and sustain losses. Moreover, the amount of such losses (or, conversely, in the case of a lower plan -- the gain) is great.

Judge for yourself. In 1977, for example, we sold 759 tons of meat and received 1.45 million rubles for it. The next year we sold 831 tons. Even if we considered the quality and condition of the cattle to be the same (although they even improved), the sovkhos should have obtained 1.57 million

rubles. However, owing to the fact that the firm plan called for 99 more tons, we earned 60,000 less rubles.

I conducted the following evaluation. During the past 4 years, the sovkhos received 5.8 million rubles for 3,319 tons of meat. If during this same period of time there had been a reduction of, let us say, 10 percent in the sales plan, we would have obtained 450,000 additional rubles for the same output. I wish to emphasize that this would have occurred without having to sell one additional kilogram of meat. If in addition we consider grain and milk, then a reduction in the plan of 10 percent would have benefited the farm to the tune of 780,000 rubles.

One might ask where did this money come from. It would be furnished by the bonus provided for above-plan output, which amounts to one half of the basic price. In essence, this bonus makes it possible to obtain different payments for products of the same quality. Moreover, the mechanism for raising the prices is infinitely simply: the lower the planned portion, the greater the above-plan high-payment portion. Hence the distortions and paradoxes. Let us assume that the sovkhos was granted the above-mentioned 10 percent reduction in its plan. During the 4 year period, it would have received 280,000 more rubles even after having reduced its sales of grain by 1,000 tons, milk -- by 100 tons and meat -- by 100 tons.

Naturally, just as soon as the possibility becomes available of selling less output and obtaining more income, greater use will be made of it: some farms operating on an economic accountability basis are consolidating their funds with no unnecessary production expenditures being required and improvements are being realized in the equipping of the enterprises, in production profitability and, in the final analysis, in the income of the people.

The earnings of the farmers are closely associated with plan fulfillment. It turns out as follows: the lower the plan, the higher the real earnings of sovkhos leaders and specialists. An objection may be raised: it is said that their salaries increase as the output sales volume called for in the industrial financial plan increases. This is correct. But this increase is negligible. I refer to the active statute on wages. If a sovkhos is transferred from the third to the second group, an increase in the planned sales volume from 2.3 million to 3.4 million rubles will serve to raise the salaries of the director and specialists by an average of 20 rubles monthly. If a sovkhos remains in the third group, with a sales total of 2.3 million rubles, then as a result of over-fulfillment of the plan (the sale of 3.4 million rubles worth of products), the director and specialists will be paid according to five monthly salary rates. You can estimate for yourself which is more profitable: to raise or lower the plan.

And what is the situation with regard to our principal workers -- machine operators, livestock breeders and middle echelon leaders? Almost the same.

The existing incentive system raises their interest in low plans in connection with both the production and sale of goods. What is the reason for this? Once again, it has to do with excessive incentives for the above-plan portion. Last year, when the grain production task for some brigades was over-fulfilled by 30-50 percent, the additional payments and bonuses for many machine operators exceeded 1,000-1,500 rubles; in some instances, these amounts were almost as large as the individual's principal earnings. For example, the basic wage for V. Bekker was 2,129 rubles and the additional incentive he received amounted to 2,030 rubles.

Thus it is easy to understand why the period devoted to planning is a very anxious one for farm workers and also for those workers assigned to rayon and oblast organizations. Nor does this apply only on the eve of the next five-year plan; rather, it occurs practically each year, owing to the fact that the tasks are corrected each year. Last autumn I visited the rayon agricultural administration and was informed that our milk sales for 1980 were planned so as to be two times higher than the average for the rayon. Yes and the percent of increase for meat was also high.

I look at the figures and my eyes see only our sovkhos and our people. I ask myself how this "surprise" will be accepted by our "3,000 ton" milkmaids Vera Sychevich, Nadezhda Oliferova and their friend brigade leader Berles Shnetbayev and all of the remaining livestock breeders. Last year they worked diligently and well. Instead of the planned amount of 3,788 tons of milk, they sold 4,594 tons to the state and instead of 790 tons of meat -- 930 tons. The reserves have been practically exhausted and it is difficult to obtain a substantial increase. Thus a further increase in the planned tasks will be a blow against the interests of the workers; although certainly more output will be produced than was the case last year, nevertheless the earnings of many will turn out to be lower -- indeed the above-plan portion and the additional payments and bonuses for it will be less.

I will cite just one example. If milkmaid V. Sychevich surpasses last year's maximum and obtains, for example, 20 more quintals of milk, her earnings will still nevertheless be less by 360 rubles.

I am now approaching the most important factor. The existing system of incentives stimulates slow growth in production. A collective which utilizes all of its reserves makes a strong surge forward, but places itself in jeopardy; during subsequent years, even in the face of tense operations, a decrease will take place in the material incentives. First of all, this will occur owing to the fact that it is more difficult to achieve an increase over a high maximum. Secondly, it will occur because the plan will be given to this collective taking into account the level achieved which, regardless of our wishes, must obviously be taken into account during agricultural planning.

These circumstances, properly speaking, result in a lesser task being "forced through" for the rayon. Subsequently, everything must be repeated

at the sovkhos. There is only one difference. We now find ourselves in the same position as the rayon workers: the plan is spread out among all of the subunits and their leaders -- the same brigade leader and livestock breeder Berles Shnetbayev, or his colleague Nikolay Zykov -- shake their heads in a dejected manner: "We have been placed in a difficult situation. We will be ruined." And similarly, just as when I was in the rayon, they prove that they lack the reserves for fulfilling the plan as outlined. And I understand them at once: indeed we are speaking here of the well being of a collective and it is clear that the existing incentive system encourages the concealment rather than the exposure of reserves.

In life, everything is interconnected. And an especially strong link exists between planning, incentives and production. If success is not achieved in "forcing through" a low task using conventional arguments, then action can be taken through production: it is advantageous to support production growth, so that later, taking into account the level achieved, a lesser plan will be obtained.

Certainly, there is no reason to believe that everything will always happen in just this manner. No. Many dynamic examples of production growth could be cited. Yes and we can take our sovkhos as an example -- since the beginning of the five-year plan, we have increased meat sales from 2,600 to 4,579 tons annually and we have raised noticeably the cropping power and yields for grain. As a result of these developments, we are being deprived of considerable incentives commencing this year.

It is no joke that all of us rural workers are disturbed over the paradoxes which exist with regard to providing incentives for the work performed by individual workers and collectives. During the July (1978) Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, a discussion took place on the need for implementing improvements in planning and economic incentives. As a practical worker who has worked for many years in the virgin lands, I believe the solution for the problem is as follows. First of all, I believe that the incentive system should be reoriented more towards stimulating plan fulfillment: the bonus for above-plan output should be removed and the payment for planned output should be increased accordingly. For example, the average sales price for 1 ton of grain at our sovkhos (taking into account a bonus) has been 12 rubles for a number of years. This should be viewed as the common price. In such a case and commencing with planning, a collective will be interested not so much in concealing but rather uncovering reserves and planning optimum tasks.

One other negative aspect associated with the effect of a bonus is disappearing. As is well known, droughts occur frequently in our zone. The harvests are low at such times. Nevertheless, the same amounts of labor and resources are invested in the harvest as during a favorable year. And even more in each unit of output. This fact is taken into consideration in some countries -- grain is more expensive during droughts. The situation is just the opposite in our country. As a result of bonuses, a quintal of grain

during favorable years, at which time the cost to a farm is less, fetches a greater price and during dry years -- a lower price. It is even very vexing at times: the elements deal a blow to the grain growers and we aggravate the situation by means of our system of payments. We increase the economic instability of the farms.

It is believed that a unified price will eliminate such shortcomings. The need for a plurality of plans will disappear. Even more important is the fact that there will no longer be any basis for those parasitical moods which encourage the use of bonuses.

Certainly, I have no ready solutions. But I believe that the Chistyakov brothers are correct: the system of incentives is in need of improvement. This is necessary in order to bring the interests of the state and the interests of each collective and individual worker closer together.

7026

CSO: 1800

NATIONAL

SELF-DETERMINATION STRUGGLE FOR MINORITIES VIEWED

LD050855 Paris LE MATIN in French 29 Apr 80 p 13

[Article by Sylvain Cypol: "The USSR Nationalist Movements Are Looking to Unite"]

[Text] The resistance of the national minorities to "big Russian" oppression is not new in the Soviet Union. How could it be otherwise when more than 10 million Ukrainians have died from starvation or in exile since the revolution, which the Baltic nations have never accepted their incorporation into the USSR, with whole peoples like the Crimean tatars and the Volga Germans deported en bloc, with latent antisemitism carefully nurtured by the authorities, when cultural and linguistic oppression reign everywhere and while school books falsify the history of the various nationalities?

The novelty in recent years is that the different nationalist movements are increasingly seeking to collaborate, to unite their scattered forces and propose political programs which tend to deal more broadly with the question of national oppression in the USSR. Thus, in 1977 Henrikas Jaskunas was tried in Vilnius for treason and anti-Soviet agitation. Jaskunas has already spent 25 years in camps in the Mordovian ASSR. Freed and "rehabilitated," he worked in an abandoned shed printing booklets and pamphlets which he signed "Organization of Independent Peoples of the USSR" in which he outlined his proposals for restructuring the Soviet Union as a federation of independent republics which would grant genuine self-determination to each nationality.

Although working alone, Jaskunas was following an identical path to that of the Lithuanian Popular National Front, which was founded in 1974 and, despite trials and repression, has so far succeeded in maintaining its work against all opposition. Of all the nationalist groups this one proposes the most elaborate program. It does not, in fact, limit itself to demanding just "Lithuania's right to self-determination (the abolition of Russian colonialism)"; it also calls for "the creation of a federation of Baltic states," for "the right of the Ukraine and Belorussia to create their own states," for "the restoration of the Caucasian states aspiring to independence," for "the right of the USSR's Muslim republics to self-determination," not forgetting "the Siberian nations."

United in their common demand for their people's independence, the nationalists are often ill-matched in their political expression. Among the Baltic peoples, especially the Lithuanians, the USSR's only Catholic nation, national feeling overlaps very closely with religious feeling. It is the same with the oldest Ukrainian groups. Apart from the Baltic peoples, and, to a lesser degree, the Armenian National Unification Party, no one is openly preaching secession from the USSR. The young Ukrainian opposition now seems to be limiting its ambitions to recognition of its country's cultural autonomy. It is the same with the Georgians and a series of Caucasian peoples. It only took the Brezhnev constitution to "forget" to grant Georgian official language status for 2,000 people to gather and demonstrate in front of the government offices in Tbilisi on 14 April 1978. The following day the omission was remedied.

A number of nationalist movements are hostile to Marxism, others are indifferent and limit themselves solely to national demands. However, some refer to it implicitly. This is particularly so with the Crimean tatars, those "Palestinians of the USSR," who have been struggling with extraordinary determination since their deportation in 1944 for a return to their homeland to found their republic there. Their main leader, Mustapha Dzhemilev, is committed to the fight in the name of Lenin's principles on the right to self-determination. Now aged 36, he has been imprisoned practically without a break for 17 years.

Finally, if all these movements are unanimous in maintaining their activity within the law and through exclusively political means, some have not hesitated to use other methods. Sabotage and arson have succeeded each other in recent years on Georgia, where a nationalist was shot at the beginning of this year for a series of bomb attacks on public buildings.

If the execution of Armenian National Unification Party member Stepan Zatikian on 30 January 1979, for throwing a bomb into the Moscow subway in 1977, was undoubtedly KGB provocation to cause terror among the Armenian nationalists, it has nevertheless cast a certain light on what threatens to occur in the future if the oppression of the various nationalities continues.

CSO: 3100

REGIONAL

SHORTCOMINGS OF ABKHAZIAN PARTY ORGANIZATIONS' WORK IN THE ARTS

Moscow SOVETSKAYA KUL'TURA in Russian 29 Feb 80 p 2

[Article by K. Dumava, leader of the lecture group, Abkhazskiy obkom of the Communist Party of Georgia, candidate of philosophical sciences]

[Text] The founder of Abkhaz literature, the national poet Dmitriy Gulia, published the first verses in the Abkhaz language at his own expense. It was not easy for him to ascend into the mountains with a bag of books on his back. But not because the burden was heavy. The poet knew that, in essence, no one had yet read his book. His native people were illiterate and the poet had had his lines printed so that people could better learn them by heart.

Now in Abkhazia over 100 books are published annually, and the Writers' Union of the republic unites over 70 professional writers.

I am comparing these two facts while turning the pages of the next issue of APSNY AKAZARA ("The Art of Abkhazia"). The publication of that journal, started last year, is still another manifestation of the concern of the party and government about the further development of Abkhaz literature and art.

A new yearbook of literary and critical articles, "Vremya i slovo" (Time and the Word), the first of its kind, also was published recently. Both these publications are intended to intensify the expressiveness of artists toward their creativity and enhance their social activity.

In the resolution of the CPSU Central Committee entitled "On the Further Improvement of Ideological and Political Educational Work" it is emphasized how important is the action of literature and art on the consciousness, on the intelligence and hearts of people. The time has come to consider one who is not interested in new things of art as having failed to keep pace with life, and the craving for it reflects to a certain degree the level of spiritual development of the personality. The party highly values the authority and influence on the masses also of works of art and the emotional expressiveness, the sincere word of the writer, the artist. For moral

ignorance is not to be overcome by enlightenment alone. "Much knowledge does not mean great wisdom," said our ancestors, having in mind that the remembrance of a compilation of standards of behavior does not mean learning to observe them, that enlightenment is only the start of moral education.

The party has presented ideological workers with the requirement not only of assuring the mastering of moral standards but also of forming moral convictions and an active attitude toward life that does not permit or tolerate the violation of moral requirements. Such quality of personality is a very important immunity toward every sort of anti-social manifestation.

Unfortunately, persistent and systematic work in this direction is clearly lacking in many primary party and social organizations of the Abkhaz Autonomous Republic. To a considerable degree it is also this which explains negative facts of a careless attitude toward labor, theft, private-property tendencies, bribery and nepotism.

The daily struggle against middle-class narrow mindedness and resistance to spiritual deficiency are within the powers of creative intelligence...

The writer, the artist and the musician by their art convince the on-looker that the inner world of man is incomparably richer than the most costly and elegant clothing. The artist is capable of showing that education, mental outlook, erudition and breadth of spiritual and esthetic aspirations are really priceless capital, that just that achievement gives men those real advantages and beauty before which the possession of any very fashionable and expensive thing fades.

The artist reflects the really beautiful in man and castigates everything unworthy. But that is when the artist is a convinced and fervent citizen. This is why the teaching of political culture by a creative intelligence is the most important business of party organizations.

However, there are many cases when lecturing and courses in the system of political education are considered in creative organizations to be burdensome. They do not always speak aloud about this, but a formal attitude toward political education still is manifested.

Sometimes in classes I note with bitterness, for example, that people very different in their creativity or temperament speak of something identically, with one and the same words. Even at various literary evenings, audience and readers' conferences, instead of an emotional figurative word of a writer, a stage manager, an actor or an artist, redundant, mechanically turned out phrases are heard. In discussing a spectacle or exhibition, colleagues often avoid their own ideas, their own analysis of a work and live discussion in which new thoughts that inspire artists could be generated withers away, is transformed into a formal act.

We are wrong in forgetting the force and infectiousness of the artist's word also in solving problems in the esthetic education of schoolchildren. Now in most schools of the republic singing and drawing are taught by more or less capable teachers of other disciplines, unfortunately as an additional load. It is natural that lessons in esthetics are perceived as an obligatory subject, and it still is not suitable to speak of an awakening of creative interests in children and their initial formation.

Isn't this why with us there are still few participants in artistic independent activity, why talented and skilled craftsmen capable of continuing the traditions of the old masters are a rare exception among the youth? What is more, an esthetically uneducated man is very vulnerable. He is incapable of distinguishing a surrogate from art and readily falls for spiritual fakes.

Courses in the system of political education, meetings with readers and spectators and personal participation in various kinds of art festivals are raising the level of the artist himself and increasing his social activity.

Unfortunately, the primary party organizations of creative collectives do not always treat such work of the artist as a very responsible party duty. It is rarely spoken of at party meetings, and at times the contribution of individual enthusiasts are unnoticed, although there are many critical comments or references. Incidentally, the atmosphere of meetings in collectives of the creative intelligentsia depends to a great extent on the cultural level of the reception of critical comments.

The level of the organizational and educational work of the party bureau is manifested willy-nilly in the course of the statements of speakers. If instead of creative there is formal discussion of a work, if they tolerate there the arrogance of some and the intolerant attitude toward criticism of others, then criticism itself at times becomes senseless. Hence stressed relations arise and a soil favorable for carping, and so for arguments.

Something like that occurred at the last congress of writers of Abkhazia, at which the speeches of a number of speakers in essence took the form of the evening of scores. Long indulgence toward considerable shortcomings in the work of the creative collective and the absence of estimation of the situation in the writers' organization on the basis of principle had their effect. That situation is now being corrected.

At the session of the board of the Abkhazskiy obkom of the Communist Party of Georgia at which the Abkhaz State Dramatic Theater imeni S. Ya. Chanba was discussed, they dealt, in particular, with such substantial shortcomings in the work of the party organization of the theater as the low level of preparation and conducting of meetings. The reports and speeches of communists, it was noted, often are superficial and do not contain a qualified analysis of the repertoire, of an individual play or the creativity of a given actor. The party organization does not properly concern itself about the steady spiritual growth of the collective. The obkom board has oriented

the party organization of the theater toward painstaking educational work with youth. Young actors of the theater are not well acquainted with their native literature and do not strive to thoroughly study the rich Abkhaz folklore and the history of the national art, or to perceive the sources of distinctive features in its musical and plastic culture.

Our nation has long attributed great importance to social opinion, to the words of famous people. What today we call publicity has a strong national basis. If a man acted in an unseemly manner, all his relatives, the entire family, gathered together to discuss the matter. Conversely, the good acts of a man became an object of legitimate family pride.

Recently this fine national tradition has been revived, in a very original manner. A large family assembles once a year. All the relatives know about the successes of each one. I have seen surprising family celebrations, and it is interesting that such a family gathering, numbering up to a hundred and even more persons, has a corrective influence. The importance of social opinion is especially great here.

Workers of literature and art enjoy enormous authority in the nation. But, unfortunately, we rarely see the leading ones among them--actors, artists, stage managers, composers, critics, even writers on large social forums or among the authors of the republic's newspapers or radio.

And again I recall the words of Dmitriy Gulia about a poet: "He knows how to write, and his books possibly will fill the libraries. But in life he is literally a kitten. In a difficult moment you do not receive a word from him."

Dmitriy Gulia showed by his life the inseparability of social activity and creativity. But he learned to live so that it could be said of the artist in the words of the Abkhaz proverb, "This man walks along the main road."

2174

CSO: 1800

REGIONAL

BRIEFS

KURD THEATER--Tbilis, Apr 2--The creation of a Kurd theatrical studio, organized recently under the Tbilisi House of Culture of State Trade Workers, was still another manifestation of the enormous concern of the party about national minorities in Georgia. In a relatively brief period young workers, students of Tbilisi VUZ's and representatives of the Kurd intelligentsia have gathered around the studio. And recently the first public appearance of participants in the studio before an audience occurred. The forces of the theatrical studio have presented to audiences for the first time humorous short plays--"A little understanding about the family" and "It's not our fault" (independent artists played excerpts from a poem of the young Kurd dramatist A. Bouk "Sndzho marries off his daughter," and verses of Kurd poets were read at evening meetings. The first appearance of the theatrical collective was definitely successful. The audience warmly greeted the participants L. Kalash, N. Babayeva, Yu. Nabiyeu, Sh. Dzhangoyev, I. Kuliyeu, T. Baloyan, Sh. Aloyev, etc. [Text] [Tbilisi ZARYA VOSTOKA in Russian 2 Apr 80 p 4] 2174

CSO: 1800

END

SELECTIVE LIST OF JPRS SERIAL REPORTS

USSR SERIAL REPORTS (GENERAL)

USSR REPORT: Agriculture
USSR REPORT: Economic Affairs
USSR REPORT: Construction and Equipment
USSR REPORT: Military Affairs
USSR REPORT: Political and Sociological Affairs
USSR REPORT: Energy
USSR REPORT: International Economic Relations
USSR REPORT: Consumer Goods and Domestic Trade
USSR REPORT: Human Resources
USSR REPORT: Transportation
USSR REPORT: Translations from KOMMUNIST*
USSR REPORT: PROBLEMS OF THE FAR EAST*
USSR REPORT: SOCIOLOGICAL STUDIES*
USSR REPORT: USA: ECONOMICS, POLITICS, IDEOLOGY*

USSR SERIAL REPORTS (SCIENTIFIC AND TECHNICAL)

USSR REPORT: Life Sciences: Biomedical and Behavioral Sciences
USSR REPORT: Life Sciences: Effects of Nonionizing Electromagnetic Radiation
USSR REPORT: Life Sciences: Agrotechnology and Food Resources
USSR REPORT: Chemistry
USSR REPORT: Cybernetics, Computers and Automation Technology
USSR REPORT: Electronics and Electrical Engineering
USSR REPORT: Engineering and Equipment
USSR REPORT: Earth Sciences
USSR REPORT: Space
USSR REPORT: Materials Science and Metallurgy
USSR REPORT: Physics and Mathematics
USSR REPORT: SPACE BIOLOGY AND AEROSPACE MEDICINE*

WORLDWIDE SERIAL REPORTS

WORLDWIDE REPORT: Environmental Quality
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Epidemiology
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Law of the Sea
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Nuclear Development and Proliferation
WORLDWIDE REPORT: Telecommunications Policy, Research and Development

*Cover-to-cover

END OF

FICHE

DATE FILMED

4 June 1980

DD.